

DISSERTATIONS.

- I. The Testimonies of JOSEPHUS concerning JESUS CHRIST, *John* the Baptist, and *James* the Just, vindicated.
- II. The Copy of the Old Testament made use of by *Josephus* proved to be that which was collected by *Nehemiah*. 81.
- III. A Reply to Dr. SYKES's Defence of his Dissertation on the Eclipse mentioned by *Pblegon*. 128
- IV. The Chronology of the sacred Scriptures, and the Truth of their Predictions confirmed by Eclipses and Astronomical Observations. 186
- V. Remarks on Sir ISAAC NEWTON's Observations upon the Prophecies of *Daniel* and the *Apocalypse*. 275
- VI. A Demonstration that our Saviour's Ministry continued at least Four Years, occasioned by a late *Dissertation on that Subject*. 347

By WILLIAM WHISTON M. A. *K*



L O N D O N,
 Printed for JOHN WHISTON at Mr. Boyle's Head in
Fleet-Street. M DCC XXXIV.

DISSERTATION



BY WILLIAM H. STODOLSKY

LONDON:
Printed by John Whiston & Co. Ltd.
1922. M.DCCCXXII.

THE
TESTIMONIES
OF
JOSEPHUS
VINDICATED.

SINCE we meet with several important Testimonies in *Josephus*, the *Jewish Historian*, concerning *John the Baptist*, the fore-runner of *Jesus of Nazareth*; concerning *Jesus of Nazareth* himself; and concerning *James the Just*, the Brother of *Jesus of Nazareth*: And since the principal Testimony, which is that concerning *Jesus of Nazareth* himself, has of late been greatly questioned by many, and rejected by some of the Learned as spurious; it will be fit for me, who have ever declared my firm Belief that these Testimonies were genuine, to set down fairly all the original Evidence and Citations I have met with in the first XV Centuries concerning them, both in their Greek and Latin Originals, and in English; and then to make proper Observations upon that intire Evidence, for the Reader's more compleat Satisfaction. In order to which, I shall first set down the Testimonies themselves, from the present Copies of *Josephus*. Desiring the Reader to add to these Testimonies such ancient Allegations of them

B

also,

also, to be produced presently, as shew how the Primitive Writers found them in their Copies.

N. B. Before I produce the Testimonies themselves out of *Josephus*, give me Leave to prepare the Reader's Attention, by setting down the Sentiments of perhaps the most learned Person and the most competent Judge that ever was, as to the Authority of *Josephus*: I mean of *Joseph Scaliger*; in the *Prolegomena* to his Book *De Emendatione Temporum*, pag. 17.

Diligentissimus, ὁ φιλαληθέστατος omnium scriptorum Josephus. De quo nos audacter dicimus, non solum in rebus Judaicis, sed etiam in externis, tutius illi credi quam omnibus Græcis ὁ Latinis: quippe cujus fides ὁ eruditio in omnibus elucet, i. e.

" *Josephus* is the most diligent and the greatest
 " Lover of Truth of all Writers. Nor are we
 " afraid to affirm of him, that 'tis more safe to be-
 " lieve him, not only as to the Affairs of the *Jews*,
 " but also as to those that are foreign to them,
 " than all the *Greek* and *Latin* Writers; and this,
 " because his Fidelity and his Compass of Learn-
 " ing are every where conspicuous." See more
 such Encomiums of *Josephus*, by the greatest Men,
 as they stand prefixed to the two last Editions of
 his Works.

The Testimony concerning John the Baptist.

* Τισὶ ὃ Ἰουδαίων ἐδό-
 κει ὀλωλέναι τὸν Ἡρώδης στρα-
 τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ μάλα δι-
 καίως τινυμὲν, καὶ ποινὴν
 Ἰωάννης τοῦ ἐπικαλυμένου Βαπ-
 τιστῆς κτείνει ὃν τὸν Ἡρώδης,
 ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τὸν Ἰουδαί-
 ον κελδόντα ἀρετὴν ἐπασκεύσας,
 καὶ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιο-
 σύνη,

Some of the *Jews* thought
 that the Destruction of *He-
 rod's* Army came from God,
 and that very justly as a Pu-
 nishment of what he did a-
 gainst *John* that was called
 the *Baptist*: for *Herod* slew
 him, who was a good Man,
 and commanded the *Jews* to
 exercise Virtue both as to
 Righte-

σύνη, καὶ πρὸς τὸ Θεὸν Διε-
 ξεία χρωμύς βαπτισμῷ συν-
 εῖναι [f. συνεῖναι.] ἔτω γὰρ
 τὸ βάπτισιν ἀποδεκτὴν αὐτῷ
 φανεῖσθαι· μὴ ἐπὶ τινων ἀ-
 μαρτίαν παραλήσει χρωμέ-
 νων †, ἀλλ' ἀφ' ἀγνείας τῆ
 σώματος· ἄτε δὲ καὶ τῆς ψυ-
 χῆς δικαιοσύνης προεκεκαθα-
 ρύτης. Καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συ-
 σσεφομένων, καὶ γὰρ ἤρθησαν
 [f. ἤσθησαν] ἐπὶ πλεῖστον τῇ
 ἀκροάσει τῶν λόγων, δέσας
 Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθα-
 νὸν αὐτῷ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, μὴ
 ἐπὶ ἀποσάσει τινα φέροι· πάν-
 τα γὰρ ἐάκεσαν συμβαλῇ τῇ
 ἐκείνης πράξοντες· πολὺ κρεῖτ-
 τον ἡγεῖται πρὶν τι νεώτερον ἐξ
 αὐτῆς γενέσθαι, προλαβὼν,
 ἀναρρεῖν· ἢ μεταβολῆς γενο-
 μένης εἰς τὰ πράγματα ἐμ-
 πεσῶν μετανοεῖν. Καὶ ὁ μὲν
 ὑποψία τῇ Ἡρώδι δέσμιος
 εἰς τὸ μαχαιρεῖντα πεμφθεὶς,
 τὸ προειρημὸν φρέλον, ταύ-
 τη κλίνῃ· τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις
 δόξαν ὅτι τιμορέα τῇ ἐκείνῃ
 τὸ ὀλεθρον ὅτι τῷ στρατῷ
 γενέσθαι· τῷ Θεῷ κακῶς Ἡρώδην
 θέλοντι. Vid. Origenem
 Hieron. & Photium infrà.

Righteousness towards one
 another, and Piety towards
 God; and so to come to
 Baptism: For that the wash-
 ing [with Water] would be
 acceptable to him, so they
 made use of it, not in order
 to the putting away [or the
 Remission] of some Sins
 [only,] but for the Purifica-
 tion of the Body: suppo-
 sing still that the Soul was
 thoroughly purified before-
 hand by Righteousness. Now
 when [many] others came
 in Crouds about him, for
 they were greatly moved
 [or pleased] by hearing his
 Words, *Herod*, who feared
 lest the great Influence *John*
 had over the People, might
 put it into his Power and
 Inclination to raise a Rebel-
 lion; (for they seemed rea-
 dy to do any thing he should
 advise) thought it best, by
 putting him to Death, to
 prevent any Mischief he
 might cause; and not to
 bring himself into Difficul-
 ties by sparing a Man, who
 might make him repent of
 it, when it should be too
 late. Accordingly he was sent
 a Prisoner, out of *Herod's*
 suspicious Temper, to *Ma-
 chærus*, the Castle I before

mentioned; and was there put to Death. Now the *Jews*
 had an Opinion, that the Destruction of the Army was
 sent as a Punishment upon him, and a Mark of God's Dis-
 pleasure to *Herod*.

The

† See Mar. i. 4. Luc. iii. 3. Constitut. VII. 40. Evang.
 secund. Hebr. ap. Grabe Spicileg. Tom. I. p. 27, 29, 30. & Orig.
 infrà.

The Testimony concerning Christ.

* Γίνετο ὁ καὶ τῆτον ὁ χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρη· ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητὴς, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἡδονῇ τάλιθῃ δεχομένων· καὶ πολλὰς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλὰς δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἐπηγάγετο· ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν, ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν, σαυρῶν ὀπιτετιμηκότων Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἷγε πρώτων αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες· ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτῃ ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν· τῶν θεῶν προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰρηκότων, εἰς ἔτι νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τῆςδε ὀνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον.

Now there was about this Time *Jesus*, a wise Man, if it be lawful to call him a Man; for he was a Doer of wonderful Works, a Teacher of such Men as receive the Truth with Pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the *Jews*, and many of the *Gentiles*. He was the Christ. And when *Pilate*, at the Suggestion of the principal Men among us, had condemned him to the Cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him: for he appeared to them alive again the third Day, as the divine Prophets had foretold these, and a vast number of other wonderful Things concerning him. And the Tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this Day.

The Testimony concerning James the Just.

† Ἀναν· νομίσας ἔχειν καιρὸν ἐπιήδειον, διὰ τὸ τεθνᾶναι μὲν Φῆσον, Ἀλβῖνον δὲ ἔτι καὶ τὸν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν, καθίζει συνέδριον κερτῶν, καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τῆς λεγομένης Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβον ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τινὰς ἐτέρας, ὡς ᾠκονομησάντων

Ananus [the High Priest] thought he had now a proper Opportunity [to exercise his Authority:] because, *Festus*, [the Governor] was dead, and *Albinus* was but upon the Road. So he assembled the Sanhedrim of Judges, and brought before them *James*, the Brother of *Jesus*,

σάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμε-
ν, παρέδωκε λείδοις ὁμοῦς,
ὅσοι ᾗ ἐδόκην ἑπιεικέστατοι ἔ-
καλ' αὖ πόλιν εἶναι, καὶ τὰ
πρὸς τὰς νόμους βαρέως ἤνεγκαν
ἐπὶ τούτῳ, καὶ πέμψουσιν πρὸς
τὸ βασιλεῖα κρύφα, πρὸς ἀκα-
λῆντες αὐτὸν ἐπιστῆλαι τῷ Ανά-
νῳ μηκέτι πράττειν, μηδὲ ᾧ
πρῶτον ὁρθῶς αὐτὸν πεποι-
ημέναι, κ. τ. λ.

Jesus, who was called *Christ*,
and some others [or some
of his Companions.] And
when he had formed an
Accusation against them, as
Breakers of the Law, he de-
livered them to be stoned.
But as for those who seemed
the most equitable of the Citi-
zens, and those who were the
most uneasy at the Breach of
the Laws, they disliked what
was done. They also sent

to the King, [*Agrippa*] desiring him to send to *Ananus*, that
he should act so no more: for that what he had already
done, was not to be justified, &c.

*The Testimony concerning Christ compared with the Style
of Josephus elsewhere: abridg'd from Mr. Daubuz.
Out of my Essay on the Old Testament, pag. 274
—279. See Daubuz, de Testimon. Joseph. Lond.
1706. 8^{vo} impens. R. Sare, p. 128—205. & ap.
Havercamp. Edit. Jos. Vol. II. p. 216—232.*

(1) Γίνεῖτο ᾗ, Γίνεῖτο ᾗ ἅπαρ τὰς ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ, καὶ μά-
λισα ἔβαβυλονίαν οἰκνύας Ἰσδαίους. *Antiq.*
XVIII. 12.

Γίνεῖτο ᾗ πρᾶξις αὐτῶν καλᾶφωρ τοῖς
ὑπηκόοις. *XX. 2.*

Γίνεῖτο ᾗ καὶ ἔκαστ' αὐτῶν οἰκνύων Ἰσδαίων
εἰσὶς πρὸς τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ Σύρας. *XX. 6.*

(2) Καλὰ τῶ-
ν ἔχρονον,

Josephus, *libris Archæologiæ priori-*
bus in hujusmodi Historiis inducendis
vocē χρόνον rarius, & vocē καιρὸς sæpi-
us: in posterioribus vero, & huic Libri
XVIII περικοπῇ propioribus vocem και-
ρὸς rarius, & vocem χρόνον sæpius: imo
& hanc phrasim non raro ipsissimam
adhibet. c. g. κατὰ τὸ ἔχρονον τῶτον
XIII. 9. κατὰ τῶτον τὸ ἔχρονον 21.

Υπὸ ᾧ τὸ αὐτὸν χρόνον Ἀντώνιος μὴ ἔτελεν
ἐν Ἀθηναῖς, XIV. 27. καὶ τῆτον τὸ χρόνον ἡ-
κονίον ὑπὸ Καππαδοκίας πρεσβυτῆ, XVI. 16.

Ἡρώδης ᾧ τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τῆτον τὸ χρόνον
σωώκην ἐννέα γυναικες. XVII. 1.

Τελότα ᾧ καὶ Φραάτης ὁ Παρθυαίων βασι-
λῆς, καὶ τῆτον τὸ χρόνον. XVIII. 3.

Καὶ ὑπὸ τὰς αὐτὰς χρόνους. 4.

Τῶν ἐν Ρώμῃ Ἰσδαίοις καὶ τῆτον τὸ χρόνον
σωτυχόνων. *ibid.*

Στασιάζειν ᾧ, καὶ αὐτὸν τὸ χρόνον, Ἰσδαίων
τὰ πρὸς Ἑλλήνας ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου πόλεως.
XIX. 2. & alia sexcenta. *ibid.*

(3) Ἰησοῦς, σο-
φὸς ἀνὴρ.
[Ἰησοῦς τις Eu-
feb. Hist.
Eccl. vide
similem lo-
cutionem
in Josepho
VIII. 2. XI.
5. XIII. 19.
& alibi sæ-
pius.]

Καὶ παρὰ γαλῶν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ,
τῆ λεγομένης Χρυσῆ. XX. 8.

Ἀνὴρ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἄκρως. I. 8. 5.

Ἀνὴρ Θεοφιλὴς, καὶ προνοίας πολλῆς ἡξιω-
μήν. ὑπὸ αὐτῆ. 20.

Ἀνὴρ μήτε σωέσεως ὧν ἐνδεὴς, μήτε τῆ τὰ
νοηθέντα πρὸς τὰς πολλὰς σαφῶς ἐξενεγκεῖν ἄ-
πειρος. V. 1.

Ἀνὴρ ἐν τῇ τυχεύσει ἀπολαύων παρὰ τοῖς ἑ-
βραίοις τιμῆς——

Ἀνὴρ δίκαιος, καὶ χρηστὸς τῇ φύσιν. VI. 14.

Ὁ ᾧ Νάθαν ἀσείν ὧν, καὶ σωειὸς ἀνὴρ.
VII. 7.

Φίλος ἀνὴρ καὶ βέλαιος. 8.

Ἀνὴρ ὧν φρενὴς, καὶ σωειδὲν τὸ λυσίτελές
ὀξύτατος. *ibid.*

Οὗτος ἀρετῶν ἀνὴρ ἐγγύς. 12.

Ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνῃ διαβόητος. IX. 9.

Ὁς ἀγαθὸς ὧν ἀνὴρ. XII. 13.

Ἄνδρα γυναικὸν καὶ μεγαλόπολεμον γυνό-
μενον. 19.

Κτείνει γὰρ τῆτον Ἡρώδης, ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα.
XVIII. 7.

Σεμνὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ δικαιοτάτος de Bell. IV.
18. [Addit nempe Josephus vocem
ἄνδρα sæpissime, præter aliorum mo-
rem.]

Εἰγε

(4) Ἐιγεῖ Ἀν-
δρα αὐτὸν
λέγειν χρη-

Ἐιγε δὲ μὴ ταῖς μαλαίαις δόξαις ἱππῶν
κολαθεῖν. Contr. Ap. I.

Καὶ ΔέλλιⓈ ἐτεροβόητο, λέγων, ἐκ ἐξ
ἀνθρώπων αὐτῷ δοκεῖν, ἀλλὰ τινⓈ Θεῷ γνέ-
σθαι τὰς παῖδας. Antiq. XV. 2.

Καὶ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα τεκμήρια τῷ ὑ-
πὲρ ἀνθρώπων αὐτῷ διωάμεως εἰσίν. III. 13.

(5) Ἦν γὰρ
παραδόξων
ἔργων ποιητής.

Τὸ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ παράδοξον ἀναφέρειν, πι-
θανὸς ὡς παρ' ἀπαιδούταις ὑπάρχειν. II. 5.

Καὶ ἐὰν δέη μὲν λόγων, περὶ παρῆξιν
ἐὰν δ' ἔργων, ἰσχυρῶς χορηγήσειν. ibid.

Πρὸς ἔν τὸ παράδοξον ἀμνηχανήσας ὁ βασι-
λεύς. ibid.

Θαυμαστὰ γὰρ καὶ παράδοξα ἄλλα τῷ προφη-
τείας ἐπιδείξαι ἔργα. IX. 5.

Ποιητής est vox propria & signata, nec
exemplis indiget.

(6) Διδάσ-
καλⓈ

Καὶ Μωϋσῆ, διδάσκαλον τῷ πρὸς Θεὸν ἐν-
σεβείας πεποιημένον. III. 2.

Τοιαύτης κακίας διδάσκαλον αὐτῷ γνό-
μενον. XVII. 14.

(7) Ἀνθρώ-
πων τῷ ἡδο-
νῇ τὰ ληθῆ δε-
χομένων.

Ἄιτιον ᾗ ἦν τῷ ἀνθρώπων τῷ ἡδονῇ δεχομένων
τὰς λόγους, σὺν τῷ φερεγγύῳ τῷ μορφῆς. ibid.

ΣέντιⓈ μὲν τοιούτοις ἐχρῆτο τοῖς λόγοις, καὶ
τῷ βελούῳ ἡδονῇ δεχομένων καὶ ὁποῖοι τῷ ἱπ-
πέων παρῆσαν. XIX. 2.

Καὶ ἡδονῇ γὰρ ἡ ἀκρόασις ὧν λέγοιεν ἐδέ-
χοντο. XVIII. 1.

Γυμνῶντες τὰς σφαγὰς ἡδονῇ δέξατο τῷ θά-
νατον ἔλεγον. 4. ἡδονῇ δεχομένων. 8. ἡδονῇ δέ-
χετο. 12.

Καὶ δεχομένων ἡ ἱκετίαν ἡδονῆς. ibid. Vid.
I. 18. III. 4. XI. 4. XVIII. 5, 11. XVI.
16. II. 3. XVII. 7, 8, 9. XVIII. 1, 8.
& XIX. 3. Phrasis est Josepho, imo
Josepho Antiquitates scribenti fere pe-
culiaris.

(8) Καὶ πολ-
λὰς μὲν Ικ-
ταῖς, πολ-

Καὶ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα τεκμήρια τῷ ὑπὲρ
ἀνθρώπων αὐτῷ διωάμεως εἰσίν. III. 13.

Πολλὰς

αὐτὸς ὃς καὶ τῷ
Ελληνικῷ ἐ-
πηγάγετο.

Πολλὰς μὲν ἀνείλε, πολλὰς δὲ ζῶντας ἐλα-
βεν. XX. 2.

Καὶ συλλαβὼν, πολλὰς μὲν αὐτῶν ἀπέκτεινε,
πλείους δὲ ζῶντας ἐλάβεν. 4.

Πολλὰ μὲν Αἰετοόβελον εἰς τὸ ἡθὺ δια-
βάλλον, πολλὰ δ' ἐπαινῶν τ' Ὑγκανον, παρ-
ήκει δέξασθαι. De Bell. I. 5.

Ενθαδὴ πολλοὶ μὲν τῷ ξένων ἔμποροι, πολ-
λοὶ δὲ τῷ ἐπιχωρίων ἀπώλοντο. IV. 41.

Τὸ δὲ Ελληνικὸν (προεῖχε) τῇ παρὰ τῷ
στρατιωτῶν αἰμύνῃ. II. 23.

Τὲς μέντοι καὶ ἀλήθειαν ἐν τοῖς Ελληνικοῖς
φιλοσοφήσαντας, ὅτε τῷ εἰρημίων ἐδὲν διήλα-
θεν. Contr. App. II.

Καλούει πᾶν τὸ Ἰσθαῖκόν τ' Ῥώμης ἀπε-
λαθῆναι. Antiq. XVIII. 5.

Ἀλλοφύλους ἐπαγόντων. XIII. 22.

Ἰσθαίων ὁπόσοις εἰς ὁμιλίαν ἀφίκετο ἐπη-
γάγετο εἰς πίσιν. XVII. 14.

Ἰησὺς τῷ λεγομένῳ Χριστῷ. XX. 8. ut
prius.

(9) Ο Χριστὸς
ἔτ' ἦν.
[Credeba-
tur esse
Christus
Hieron.]
Καὶ αὐτὸν,

Καὶ αὐτὸν, plusquam sexcenties apud
Iosephum in principio periodi.

(10) Ενδείξει
τῷ πρώτων
ἀνδρῶν

Αἱ τῷ πρώτων καὶ τῷ γένος τῷ αὐτῶν ἔμελλον
ἔσεσθαι. XIV. 25.

Ἐπανιόντων ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου τῷ πρώτων. XV.
10.

Διαφθοραῖς ἀνδρῶν τῷ πρώτων. XVIII. 1.

Οἷτε πρῶτοι τῷ τῇδε ἐκλείνοντο ἀνδρῶν. 6.

Καὶ τῷ πρώτων παρ' ἑτέροις ἀνδρῶν πρᾶσ-
τόντων. ult.

Δωρεῶν τοῖς πρώτοις. XIX. 6.

Τοῖς πρώτοις τῷ Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν. XX. 2.

Οἱ δὲ πρῶτοι καὶ τιμὴν καὶ γένος τῷ Ἱεροσο-
λυμιτῶν. 5.

Καλούει

Κελδαίη ὃ καὶ τοῖς ᾤ Σαμαρείων πρώτοις, καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίων. *ibid.* & alibi frequentissime.

Παρ' ἡμῖν,

Ὁς Νισαὴν παρ' ἡμῖν καλεῖ. III. 10.

Ἑορτὴ δ' ἐστὶν αὐτῇ παρ' ἡμῖν εἰς τὰ μά-
λισα τηρεμένη. XV. 3.

Παρεὶ μὲν ἡμῖν μέχρ' ἡλὶς δύσεως ἀτά-
φους κρύπτειν ἔκλειαν. *De Bell.* III. 25.

Ὡς περ δὴ παρ' ἐκάστοις ἄλλη τις εὐγενείας
ὑπόθεσις, ἔτω παρ' ἡμῖν ἡ τὴν ἱεροσύνης μετε-
σεία τεκμήριον ἐστὶν γένους λαμπρότητι. *De*
vitâ sua in initio.

(11) Σταυρῷ
ἐπιτετιμηκό-
τῃ Πιλάτῃ

Ἐπιτιμᾶν *pro punire, vel poenæ ad-*
dicere raro apud alios, frequenter apud
Josephum, præsertim in hoc ipso Ca-
pite usurpatur.

Τιμησαμένων αὐτὸν τῷ μέτρῳ τῆς δίκης,
πληγῶν ἔφασαν καὶ δεσμῶν. XIII. 18.

Ενδεία σιτίων θάνατον ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ κα-
λῶς ἔχειν ἐνόμισεν. XVIII. 4.

Μένδρῳ ὃ φυγῆς ἐτίμησαν. *ibid.*

Καὶ τιμορίας τε ἐπέτιμα τοῖς ἀλῆσι. 6.

Δίκην αὐτῇ ἐπέτιμησεν ὁ Θεός. 9.

Ἐπιτιμᾶν φυγῇ. *De Bell.* II. 15.

Θάνατον ἐπιτιμῶντε τοῖς πειθαρχῆσι τῇ Ρω-
μαίων ἡγεμονίᾳ. 23.

Εαυτοῖς βίαιον ἐπιτιμῆσομεν. III. 25.

(12) Οὐκ
ἐπαύσαντο οἱ
τὸ πρῶτον ἀ-
γαπήσαντες.

Λησαὶ τὴν Τράχωνα καλοικῆντες τεσσαρῆκοντα
τὸ πρῶτον, ἔτα αὐτοῖς πλείονες. XVI. 16,
& alibi sæpius. *Quemadmodum etiam*
verba ἐπαύσαντο, & ἀγαπήσαντες & phrasis
ἐπαύσαντο ἀγαπήσαντες.

(13) Εφάνη
ᾧ αὐτοῖς τε-
τηνέχων ἡμέ-
ραν, πάλιν
ζῶν. [Deest
ἔχων apud
Euseb. se-
mel]

Τῷ προφήτῃ Νάθαν φανερὸν ἦν τὰς ὕπνους.
VII. 7.

Φανερὸν ᾧ αὐτῷ ἦν τὰς ὕπνους ἐκείνης τῆς νυ-
κτός. VIII. 2.

Φανέντα ἦν τὰς ὕπνους αὐτῷ τὸ Θεὸν ἐπηρεῶν.
XIII. 20.

Ὅτι ἦν τὰς ὕπνους ἡ Ἰσις ἐφάνη τῷ Ἀμφίω-
φει. *Contr. Ap.* I.

(14) Τῶν
Θείων προ-
φητῶν ταῦτα
ἢ ἄλλα μυ-
ρία θαυμα-
σια πρὸς αὐ-
τῶν εἰρηκότων.

(15) Εἰς τε
νῦν [vel Εἰς
ἔτι τε νῦν]

(16) Τῶν
Χερσιανῶν
ὑπὸ τῷδε ὀνο-
μασμένων

(17) Οὐκ ἐ-
πέλειπε τὸ
φῦλον

Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ χαλεπὰ Ἀπίωνος εἰρηκότῳ.
XVIII. 10.

Τῶν κατήγορων ὅτι νεώτατόν ἐστιν εἰρηκότων.
Contr. Ap.

Ἔτι καὶ νῦν διαμύθει. I. 22.
Αναγινώσκει παρ' ἡμῶν ἔτι καὶ νῦν. X.
ult.

Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ Ἀγρίππα Σεβαστῆ καὶ
Ἀγριππίας πόλεις ἕτεροι μετωνομάσθησαν.
De Bell. I. 4.

Καὶ τερσὶ τοῖς ἡδίσοις προσώποις αὐ-
τῶν ὀνόμασε τὰς πόλεις. — ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων προσ-
αγορεύθεις. VI. 13.

Τόνδε μὲν Σέθων, καὶ ἡ Ραμέσσην, ὑπὸ Ρα-
ψῆς τῶν πατρὸς ὀνομασμένων. Contr. Ap. I.

Οὐκ ἐπέλειπε δ' εἰδὲν αὐτῶν τέτων. Antiq.
VIII. 7.

Ἰσθαῖον φύλον. III. 24, & alibi sæpissime.

N. B. Since *Tanaquil Faber* pretended that *Eusebius*, who twice alleges this Testimony of *Josephus*, as we shall see presently, did himself forge it out of his own Head: Hear what this our accurate Examiner of its Style, Mr. *Daubuz*, says as to that Matter, and judge what little Reason *Faber* had on his Side, when, on Account of its Style, he not only denied the Passage to belong to *Josephus*, but supposed it to be the Composition of *Eusebius*. His Words in *English* are these: "I affirm, that I have found the Style of *Eusebius* to be intirely unlike to this Testimony in *Josephus*; and that there is scarce one Phrase in this whole Passage which expresses the genuine familiar Language of *Eusebius*." *Sub finem*.

The ancient CITATIONS of the Testimonies of Josephus from his own Time, till the End of the XVth Century : (including the remarkable Attestations of Suetonius and Dio to Josephus's Veracity) [See most of these Testimonies, in part or in whole, prefixed before the two last Editions of Josephus.]

Sueton. in Vespas. C. V.

Apud Judæam, Carmeli Dei Oraculum consulentem [Vespasianum,] ita confirmavere sortes, ut quicquid cogitaret volveretque animo, quamlibet magnum, id esse proventurum pollicerentur. Et unus è nobilibus Captivis Josephus; cum conjiceretur in vincula, constantissime asseveravit, fore ut ab eodem brevi solveretur, verum jam imperatore.

When Vespasian was consulting the Oracle of the God Carmelus, in Judæa, the Lots assured him, that whatever he should think of, or resolve in his Mind, tho' it were never so great, it should come to him. Josephus also, one of the Nobility that was among the Captives, did most constantly affirm, when he was cast into Bonds, that he should be loosed by him; but not till he was become Emperor.

Xiphilin. Epit. Dion. in Vespas. p. 317.

Ἰώσηππος ὃ ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος, ἀρχαῖς τε ὑπ' αὐτῶν πρότερον καὶ δεθείς, ἐγέλασε καὶ ἔφη, Νῦν μὲν με δέσεις, μετ' ἐνιαυτὸν δὲ λύσεις, αὐτοκράτωρ γινώσκων.

Now Josephus, a Jew, that was already caught by him, and bound, laughed, and said, "Thou wilt now bind me: but in a Year's Time wilt loose me, when thou art Emperor." [He was in Bonds about two Years.]

About A. D. 147. Just. Mart. Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 234.

Εγνώκατε [Ἰουδαῖοι] αὐτὸν ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ἀναβάντα εἰς τὸ ἔσχατον· ὡς αἱ προφητεῖαι προεμύνον χρησόμενον.

You [Jews] knew that Jesus was risen from the Dead, and ascended into Heaven; as the Prophecies did foretell was to happen.

Επὶ

About

About A. D. 230. Origen. Comment. in Matth.
p. 230.

Επὶ τοσούτον ἦ διέλαμπεν
ἔτι ὁ Ἰάκωβος ἐν τῷ λαῷ
ὅτι δικαιοσύνη, ὡς Φλάβιον
Ἰώσηπον ἀναγράψαντα ἐν ἑ-
κοσι βιβλίοις ἡ Ἰουδαϊκὴν Ἀρχ-
αιολογίαν, ἡ αἰτίαν παρ-
εῖναι ἐκλόμην τῶν τὰ τοι-
αῦτα πεπονθέναι ἡ λαὸν, ὡς
καὶ ἡ ναὸν κατασκαφῆναι,
εἰρηκέναι καὶ μὴν Θεὸς ταῦτα
αὐτοῖς ἀπηντηκέναι, διὰ τὰ εἰς
Ἰάκωβον, ἡ ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τῶ
λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν
τέλοσμεναι. καὶ τὸ θαυμάσιον
ἐστίν, ὅτι ἡ Ἰησοῦν ἡμῶν ἐκ κατα-
δεξάμενος εἶναι Χριστόν, ἐδὲν
ἦτον Ἰακώβω δικαιοσύνην ἐ-
μαρτύρησε ποσάτην· λέγει ἦ,
ὅτι καὶ ὁ λαὸς ταῦτα ἐνόμιζε
διὰ ἡ Ἰακώβον πεπονθέναι.

This *James* was of so shi-
ning a Character among the
People, on Account of his
Righteousness, that *Flavius*
Josephus, when, in his XX
Books of the *Jewish Anti-*
quities, he had a mind to set
down what was the Cause
why the People suffer'd such
Miseries, till the very Holy
House was demolish'd, he
said, that these Things befel
them by the Anger of God,
on account of what they had
dared to do to *James*, the
Brother of *Jesus* who was
called *Christ*. And wonder-
ful it is, that, while he did
not receive *Jesus* for *Christ*,
he did nevertheless bear wit-
ness that *James* was so righ-
teous a Man. He says far-
ther, that the People thought
that they suffer'd these things
for the Sake of *James*.

About A. D. 250. Contr. Cels. L. I. p. 35, 36.

Εκλόμην δ' ὅν Κέλσος,
προσωποποιήσαντι ἡ Ἰουδαῖον
παρεδεξάμενον πως Ἰωάννην
ὡς Βαπτιστὴν, βαπτίζοντα ἡ
Ἰησοῦν, εἰπεῖν, ὅτι τὸ Ἰωάννην
γεγονέναι βαπτιστὴν εἰς ἄφεσιν
ἁμαρτημάτων βαπτίζοντα ἀνέ-
γεγράφε τις ἡ μετ' ἐπὶ πολὺ τῶ
Ἰωάννῃ καὶ τῶ Ἰησοῦ γεγενημέ-
ων.

I would say to *Celsus*, who
personates a *Jew* that ad-
mitted of *John the Baptist*,
and how he baptized *Jesus*,
that one who lived but a lit-
tle while after *John* and *Je-*
sus, wrote, how that *John*
was a Baptizer unto the Re-
mission of Sins. For *Jose-*
phus testifies in the XVIIIth
Book

ων. Εν ᾧ τῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ
 καὶ Ἰεδαϊκῆς Αρχαιολογίας, ὁ
 Ἰωσήπ[Ⓞ] μαρτυρεῖ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ,
 ὡς Βαπτιστῇ γεννημένῳ, καὶ
 καθάριστον πῶς βαπτισαμένους
 ἐπαγγελλομένῳ. ὁ δ' αὐτὸς,
 καί ποτε ἀπιστῶν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὡς
 Χριστῷ, ζητῶν καὶ αἰτίαν τῆς
 Ἱεροσολύμων πτώσεως, καὶ τῆς
 τῶν ναῶν καθαιρέσεως, δέον αὐ-
 τὸν εἰπεῖν ὅτι ἡ καὶ τῶν Ἰησοῦ
 μηχανῶν αἰτία γέγονε
 τῷ λαῷ, ἐπεὶ ἀπέκτειναν τὸν
 προφητοδύον Χριστόν. Ὁ
 δ' καὶ ὡς περ ἄκων ἐμακροῦν
 τῆς ἀληθείας γινόμεν[Ⓞ], φησὶ
 ταῦτα συμβεβηκέναι πῶς Ἰε-
 δαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου
 τῆς δικαίας, ὅς ἦν ἀδελφὸς
 Ἰησοῦ τῷ λεγομένῳ Χριστῷ. ἐπει-
 δὴ περ δικαιοτάτον αὐτὸν ὄντα
 ἀπέκτειναν. Τὸν δ' Ἰακώβον
 τῆτον ὁ Ἰησοῦ γνήσι[Ⓞ] μαθητὴς
 Παῦλός φησιν ἐωρακέναι, ὡς
 ἀδελφὸν τῶν Κυρίων, καὶ τοσούτον
 διὰ τὸ πρὸς αἱματὶ[Ⓞ] συγγενὲς,
 ἢ καὶ κοινὴν αὐτῶν ἀναλαροφὴν,
 ὅσον διὰ τὸ ἦθ[Ⓞ], καὶ τὸ λόγον.
 Ἐπεὶ ἔνδι[Ⓞ] Ἰακώβον συμβε-
 βηκέναι λέγει πῶς Ἰεδαίοις τὰ
 καὶ τὰ ἐρήμωσιν τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ,
 πῶς ἐχὶ ὀλογώτερον διὰ
 Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν τῆτο φάσκειν
 γεγονέναι; κ. τ. λ.

for the Sake of *James*, with how much greater Reason
 might he have said, that it happened for the Sake of *Je-*
sus? &c.

Book of *Jewish* Antiquities,
 that *John* was the Baptist;
 and that he promised Purifi-
 cation to those that were
 baptized. The same *Jose-*
phus also, altho' he did not
 believe in *Jesus* as *Christ*,
 when he was enquiring after
 the Cause of the Destruction
 of *Jerusalem*, and of the De-
 molition of the Temple, and
 ought to have said, that their
 Machinations against *Jesus*
 were the Cause of those Mi-
 series coming on the People;
 because they had slain that
Christ, who was foretold by
 the Prophets, he, tho' as it
 were unwillingly, and yet as
 one not remote from the
 Truth, says, These Miseries
 befel the *Jews* by way of
 Revenge for *James the Just*,
 who was the Brother of *Je-*
sus that was called *Christ*;
 because they had slain him
 who was a most righteous
 Person. Now this *James*
 was he whom that genuine
 Disciple of *Jesus*, *Paul*, said
 he had seen as the Lord's Bro-
 ther, [Gal. i. 19.] which Re-
 lation implies not so much
 nearness of Blood, or the
 sameness of Education, as it
 does the Agreement of Man-
 ners and Preaching. If there-
 fore he says the Desolation
 of *Jerusalem* befel the *Jews*

L. II. p. 69.

Τίτῳ καθῆκε ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ὡς μὴ Ἰωσήφῳ γράφει, διὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸ δίκαιον, τὸ ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ· ὡς ἡ ἀλήθεια παρῆναι, διὰ Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν τὸ Θεόν.

Titus destroyed Jerusalem, according to Josephus, on account of James the Just, the Brother of Jesus, who was called Christ: but in Truth, on Account of Jesus, the Christ of God.

About A. D. 324. Euseb. Demonstr. Evan. L. III.
p. 124.

Ἀυτάρκης μὲν ἐν ἡμῶνδε τυγχάνει περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν μαρτυρία· ἐδὲν ἡ οἶον ἐκ περὶ σίας ἡ τῷ ἐξ Ἑβραίων Ἰωσήφῳ μαρτυρεῖ χρῆσθαι· ὅς ἐν τῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ τῇ Ἰουδαϊκῇ Ἀρχαιολογίᾳ, καὶ τῷ Πιλάτῃ χρόνῳ, ἰσορῶν, μέμνηται τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐν τέτοις· Γίνεσθαι κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἀνδρῶν αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆ· ἦν γὰρ παρὰ δόξαν ἔργων ποιητῆς, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἀληθείας σεβομένων· καὶ πολλὰς μὲν τῇ Ἰουδαϊκῇ, πολλὰς δὲ καὶ Ἑλληνικῇ ἐπηγάγετο. Ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀρχόντων, σωρῶν ὑπερηφανότατον Πιλάτῃ, ἐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπήσαντες· ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν. Τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε, καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ

Certainly the Attestation of those I have already produced concerning our Saviour may be sufficient. However, it may not be amiss if, over and above, we make use of Josephus the Jew for a farther Witness. Who in the XVIIIth Book of his Antiquities, when he was writing the History of what happen'd under Pilate, makes mention of our Saviour in these Words. Now there was about this Time Jesus, a wise Man, if it be lawful to call him a Man: for he was a Doer of wonderful Works, a Teacher of such Men as had a Veneration for Truth. He drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the Suggestion of the principal Men among us, had condemned him to the Cross, those that loved

αὐτῷ εἰρηκότων· ὅθεν εἰσέτι
 νῦν ἀπὸ τῆςδε τῆς Χερσιανῶν
 ἐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ Φῦλον. Ἐι
 ποίνυν καὶ τῆς ἰσορικῶν μαρτυρεῖ,
 ὡς μόνον τῆς δώδεκα ἀποστό-
 λους, ἐδὲ τῆς ἐβδομήκοντα μα-
 θηταῖς ἐξακειωμένῳ, ἀλλὰ
 πολλοὺς μὲν τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς, πολ-
 λὰς δὲ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς προσαγό-
 μῳ, δηλῶ ἀν εἶη πλεί-
 τόν τι κεκτημένῳ πᾶσι τῆς
 λοιπῆς ἀνθρώπων. Πῶς γὰρ
 ἀν ἄλλως προσήγετο τῆς Ἰ-
 ουδαϊκῆς καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς πλείους,
 εἰ μὴ τοῖσι θαυμαστοῖς καὶ παρ-
 αδόχοις ἔργοις, καὶ ξηνίζσῃ
 κέχρητο διδασκαλίᾳ; μαρτυ-
 ρεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν πράξεων τῶν
 ἀποστόλων γραφή, ὅτι πολλαὶ
 μυριάδες ἦσαν Ἰουδαίων ἀν-
 δρῶν πεπεισμένων αὐτὸν εἶ-
 ναι τὸν Χριστὸν τῆς Θεᾶς, καὶ ὑπὸ
 προφητῶν κατήγγελμένον.

loved him at first did not forsake him: for he appear'd to them alive again the third Day, as the divine Prophets had spoken of these, and a vast Number of other wonderful Things concerning him. Whence the Tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this Day. If therefore we have this Historian's Testimony, that he not only brought over to himself the Twelve Apostles, with the Seventy Disciples, but many of the *Jews*, and many of the *Gentiles* also. He must manifestly have had somewhat in him extraordinary, above the rest of Mankind. For how otherwise could he draw over so many of the *Jews*, and of the *Gentiles*, unless he perform'd admirable and amazing Works, and used a Method of Teaching that was not common?

Moreover, the Scripture of the *Acts of the Apostles* bears witness, that there were many *Myriads* of *Jews* who were persuaded that he was the *Christ* of God, who was foretold by the Prophets. [*Acts* xxi. 20.]

About A. D. 330. Hist. Eccles. I. 11.

Τῆς Βαπτιστῆς Ἰωάννης ὑπὸ
 τῆς νέας Ηρώδης τῆς κεφαλὴν ἀ-
 πομνηθέντῳ μνημονόει μὲν
 ἡ θεία τῶν βιβλίων γραφή.
 Συνιστορεῖ γεμὴν καὶ ὁ Ἰωσήπῳ,
 ἐνομασίᾳ τῆς τε Ηρωδιάδῳ
 μνήμην πεποιημένῳ, καὶ ὡς
 ἀδελφῆ γυναῖκα εἶσαν αὐτὴν
 ἡγάγετο

Now the divine Scripture of the Gospels makes mention of *John the Baptist*, as having his Head cut off by the younger *Herod*. *Josephus* also concurs in this History, and makes mention of *Herodias* by Name, as the Wife of his Brother, whom *Herod*

ἡγάγετο πρὸς γάμον Ἡρώδης,
 ἀθετήσας μὲν τὸ πρὸς τὴν αὐ-
 τῷ καὶ νόμους γεσημημένην γυ-
 ναῖκα. Ἀρέτα δ' ἦν αὐτῇ τῇ
 Πιτρεαίων βασιλέως θυγάτηρ.
 Τὴν δ' Ἡρωδιάδα ζῶντι δια-
 σήσας τῷ ἀνδρὶ, δι' ἣν καὶ τὸ
 Ἰωάννην ἀνελὼν πόλεμον αἶρε
 πρὸς τὸν Ἀρέταν, [f. πρὸς αὐτὸν
 Ἀρέτας] ὡς ἂν ἡτιμασμένης
 αὐτῇ τῷ θυγατρὸς· ἐν ᾧ πο-
 λέμῳ μάχης χυομένης πάντας
 φησὶν τὸν Ἡρώδην στρατὸν δια-
 φθαρῆναι· καὶ ταῦτα πεπον-
 θέναι τὸν Ὀπιδελῆς ἐνεκεν τῷ
 καὶ Ἰωάννῃ γεσημημένης. Ὁ
 δ' αὐτὸς Ἰωσήφ· ἐν τοῖς μά-
 λιστα δικαιότατον καὶ βαπτιστὴν
 ὁμολογῶν γερονέναι τὸν Ἰωάννην,
 πῶς περὶ αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν δια-
 γελίων γραφὴν ἀναγεγραμ-
 μένοις συμμαρτυρεῖ. Ἰσορεῖ δ'
 καὶ τὸν Ἡρώδην τὸν βασιλείας
 ἀποπεπλωκέναι διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν
 Ἡρωδιάδα, μεθ' ἧς αὐτὸν καὶ
 εἰς τὴν ὑπερορίαν ἀπεληλάσθαι
 Βιένναν τὴν Γαλλίας πόλιν
 οἰκεῖν καὶ ἀδικαδοθέντα. Καὶ
 ταῦτά γε αὐτῷ ἐν ὀκτωκαιδε-
 κάτῳ τῷ Ἀρχαιολογίας δεδή-
 λω· ἐνθα συλλαβαῖς αὐταῖς
 περὶ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ ταῦτα γράφει.
 Τισὶ δ' τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐδόκει ὁλω-
 λέναι τὸν Ἡρώδην στρατὸν ὑπὸ τῷ
 Θεῷ, καὶ μάλα δικαίως τιν-
 νυμῶς, καὶ ποινὴν Ἰωάννῃ τῷ
 καλημῶς Βαπτιστῇ· κτείνει γὰρ
 τὸν Ἡρώδην, ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα,
 καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κελόοντα
 ἀρετὴν

Herod had married, upon di-
 vorcing his former lawful
 Wife. She was the Daugh-
 ter of Aretas, King of the
 Petrean Arabians; and which
 Herodias he had parted from
 her Husband while he was
 alive. On whose Account
 also, when he had slain John,
 he made War with Aretas;
 [f. Aretas made War with
 him] because his Daughter
 had been used dishonourably.
 In which War, when it came
 to a Battle, he says, that all
 Herod's Army was destroy'd;
 and that he suffer'd this be-
 cause of his wicked Contriv-
 ance against John. More-
 over the same Josephus, by
 acknowledging John to have
 been a most righteous Man,
 and the Baptist, conspires in
 his Testimony with what is
 written in the Gospels. He
 also relates, that Herod lost
 his Kingdom for the Sake of
 the same Herodias; together
 with whom he was himself
 condemned to be banish'd to
 Vienna, a City of Gall. And
 this is his Account in the
 XVIIIth Book of Antiqui-
 ties; where he writes thus
 of John verbatim: Some of
 the Jews thought that the
 Destruction of Herod's Army
 came from God, and that
 very justly, as a Punishment
 for what he did against John
 that was called the Baptist;
 for Herod slew him, who
 was a good Man, and one
 that commanded the Jews to
 exer-

ερετην επασησαι, και τη
 προς αλληλους δικαιοσυνη, και
 προς τ̃ Θεον οσιεδια χρη-
 μων, βαπτισμῳ συνειναι
 [σ. συνειναι.] Ετω γδ̃ και τ̃
 θ̃απισιν αποδελην αυτω φα-
 ειδης, μη επι τινων αμαρ-
 ταιδων παρελθης χωρημων,
 αλλ̃ εφ̃ αγγελια τῷ σωματι·
 ατε δη και τ̃ ψυχης δικαιο-
 συνη προεκεκαθαρημης. Και
 τ̃ αλλων συσσεφομηων, και
 γδ̃ ηδουσαν ὀπιπλεστον τη α-
 κροασει τ̃ λογων, δεισας Ηρω-
 δης το ὄπι ποσοιτε πεθανον
 αυτω τοις ανθρωποις, μη ὄπι
 αποσας φεροιτο· παντα γδ̃
 εωκεσαν συμβαλη τη εκεινη
 περξοντες· πολυ κρετιον η-
 γεται πειν τι νεωτερον απ̃
 αυτω γενεσθαι προλαβων αν-
 αιρειν, η̃ μεταβολης γενομης
 εις περξυμια εμπειων με-
 τανοειν. Και ο̃ μω̃ υποψια
 τῷ Ηρωδῃ δεσμιῳ̃ εις τ̃
 Μαχαιρεν̃ια πεμφεις, το
 προσηρημενον φρελον, ταυτη
 κτιννυ). Ταυτα περ̃ τῷ Ιω-
 αννη διελθων, η̃ τῷ Σωληρῳ̃
 ημων η̃ τ̃ αυτην τῷ συγ-
 γερ̃μω̃ ιερολ̃αν ὡδε πως
 μερην). Γινεται ὃ η̃ τῷτον
 τ̃ χροτον Ιησους τις, σοφος
 ανηρ, εἶγε ανδρα αυτον λε-
 γειν η̃ η̃ γδ̃ παροδων
 εργων ποιητης, διδασκαλῳ̃
 ανθρωπων τ̃ συν ηδονη τα-
 ληθη δεχημενων. και πολλα
 μω̃ τ̃ Ιουδαων, πολλας ὃ η̃
 ὄπι

exercise Virtue, both as to
 Righteousness towards one
 another, and Piety towards
 God, and so to come to
 Baptism; for that by this
 means the washing [with
 Water] would appear accept-
 able to him, when they made
 use of it, not in order to
 the putting away [or the Re-
 mission] of some Sins [only]
 but for the Purification of
 the Body: supposing still that
 the Soul were thoroughly pu-
 rified before-hand by Righte-
 ousness. Now when [many]
 others came in Clouds about
 him, for they were greatly de-
 lighted in hearing his Words,
Herod was afraid that this so
 great Power of persuading
 Men might tend to some
 Sedition or other, for they
 seemed to be disposed to do
 every thing he should advise
 them to, so he supposed it bet-
 ter to prevent any Attempt
 for a Mutation from him, by
 cutting him off, than after
 any such Mutation should be
 brought about, and the Pub-
 lick should suffer, to repent
 [of such Negligence]. Ac-
 cordingly he was sent a Pri-
 soner, out of *Herod's* suspi-
 cious Temper, to *Macharus*,
 the Castle I before mention-
 ed, and was there put to
 Death. When *Josephus* had
 said this of *John*, he makes
 mention also of our Saviour
 in the same History, after
 this Manner: Now there
 was about this Time one
 D Jesus,

ὁ δὲ ἑλληνικὴ ἐκπαίδευτος.
ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν, καὶ αὐτὸν, ἐκ-
δείκνυσι πρῶτον ἀνδρῶν παρ'
ἡμῶν, ταυτοῦ Θεοτοκίου.
Πλάττει, καὶ ἐκπαύσας οἱ τὸ
πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες,
Ἰωάννη δὲ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων
ἡμερᾶν, πάλιν ζῶν. Τῶν
Θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ
ἄλλα μυστὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυ-
μάσια κερκῶν. εἰσέτι τε
νῦν τὸ χριστιανῶν, ὁ δὲ τῷδε
ὀνομασμένον, καὶ ἐπέλιπε τὸ
φύλον. Ταῦτά τε ἐξ Ἑβραίων
συγγενείας ἀνέκαθεν τῇ
ἐαυτοῦ γενεῇ περὶ τε Βαπτιστῆ
Ἰωάννη, καὶ τῷ Σωτῆρι ἡμῶν
ἡμετέροισι, τίς ἂν ἡπι-
λίποιται δόσφυγῃ, κ. τ. λ.

Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this Day. And since this Writer, sprung from the *Hebrews* themselves, has delivered these Things above, in his own Work, concerning *John the Baptist* and our Saviour, what Room is there for any farther Evasion, &c.

Π. 23. Οὕτω δὲ ἄρα
θαυμάσιος τις ἦν καὶ περὶ
τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἡμῶν δικαιο-
σύνην βεβόητο ὁ Ἰάκωβος, ὡς
καὶ τὸς Ἰουδαίων ἡμφορέας δο-
ξάζειν ταύτην εἶναι καὶ αἰτίαν
τῷ περὶ ἡμῶν μὲν τὸ μαρτύ-
ριον αὐτοῦ πολιορκίας τῇ Ἰε-
ρουσαλὴμ· ἦν δὲ ἕδεν ἕτερον
αὐτοῖς συμβῆναι, ἢ ἂν τὸ
κατ' αὐτὸν τολμηθὲν ἄγῃ. ὁ
γὰρ Ἰωσήφος καὶ ἀπάνησε καὶ
τῷ ἐκείνῳ ἡμφορέας ἡμφορέας
ἡμῶν, δι' ὃν φησι λέγειν.
Ταῦτα

Jesus, a wise Man, If it be lawful to call him a Man; for he was a Doer of wonderful Works, a Teacher of such Men as receive the Truth with Pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the *Jews*, and many of the *Gentiles* also. He was the *Christ*. And when *Pilate*, at the Suggestion of the principal Men among us, had condemned him to the Cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third Day, as the Divine Prophets had foretold these and a vast Number of other wonderful Things concerning him. And still the Tribe of *Christians*,

Now *James* was so wonderful a Person, and was so celebrated by all others for Righteousness, that the judicious *Jews* thought this to have been the Occasion of that Siege of *Jerusalem*, which came on presently after his Martyrdom; and that it befel them for no other Reason, than that impious Fact they were guilty of against him. *Josephus* therefore did not refuse to attest thereto in Writing, by the Words following: These Miseries befel

αὐτὰ ἡ συμβεβηκεν Ἰουδαίοις
κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου τῆ
μαίης, ὃς ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ
τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, ἐπειδὴ περ
ἐκαιοτάτοιον αὐτὸν ὄντα οἱ Ἰου-
δαῖοι ἀπέκτειναν.

Ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ θάνατον
αὐτοῦ ἐν εἰκοσῷ τῷ Ἀρχαιολο-
γίας δηλοῖ Διά τῶν Πέμ-
τει ἡ Καῖσαρ Ἀλβίνον εἰς τὴν
Ἰουδαίαν ἐπαρχον, Φῆσιν καὶ
τελευτήν πυθόμενος. ὃς ἡ νε-
ώτερος Ἀνανός, ὃν καὶ δε-
χιερωσύνην ἔπομεν παρελη-
φέναι, θρασυς ἦν καὶ τρόπον,
καὶ τολμητὴς διαφερόντως,
αἰρησιν ἡ μέλει καὶ Σαδδου-
καίων, οἵτις εἰσι πρὸς τὰς
κρίσεις ὡμοὶ πρὸς πάντας τὰς
Ἰουδαίους, καθὼς ἡδη δεδηλώ-
καμεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦν τοιοῦτος ὢν
ὁ Ἀνανός, νομίσας ἔχειν και-
ρὸν θητήθειον, δια τὸ τεθνά-
ναι μὲν Φῆσον, Ἀλβίνον δὲ ἔτι
ἔσθαι καὶ ὁδὸν ὑπάρχον, καθ-
ίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν, καὶ
παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ καὶ ἀδελ-
φὸν Ἰησοῦ τῷ Χριστῷ λεγομένον,
(Ἰακώβος ὄνομα αὐτοῦ) καὶ
τινας ἑτέρας, ὡς παρανομησάν-
των κατήγοράν ποιησάμενος,
παρέδωκε λυθισομένους. ὁ-
σοι δ' ἰδοὺν θητικέσταιοι καὶ
ἔσθαι πάλιν εἶναι, καὶ τὰ πρὸς
τὰς νόμους ἀκριβεῖς, βαρέως
ἠνεγκαν θη τῶν καὶ πέμ-
πται πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν κρύφα,
παρακαλῶντες αὐτὸν θησι-
λαί τῷ Ἀνάνῳ μηκέτι τοι-
αῦτα

beset the Jews by way of
Revenge for James the Just,
who was the Brother of Je-
sus that was called Christ;
on this Account, that they
had slain him who was a
most righteous Person.

The same Josephus de-
clares the Manner of his
Death in the XXth Book of
Antiquities in these Words:
Caesar sent Albinus into Ju-
dea, to be Procurator, when
he had heard that Festus was
dead. Now Ananus junior,
who, as we said, had been
admitted to the High-Priest-
hood, was in his Temper
bold and daring in an ex-
traordinary Manner. He was
also of the Sect of the Sad-
ducees, who are more savage
in Judgment than any of the
other Jews, as we have al-
ready signified. Since there-
fore this was the Character
of Ananus, he thought he
had now a proper Opportu-
nity [to exercise his Autho-
rity:] because Festus was
dead, and Albinus was but
upon the Road. So he as-
sembles the Sanhedrim of
Judges, and brings before
them James, the Brother of
Jesus, who was called Christ;
and some others [of his
Companions:] and when he
had formed an Accusation
against them, as Breakers of
the Law, he delivered them
to be stoned. But as for
those who seemed the most
equitable of the Citizens,

αὐτὰ πείσθη· μὴδὲ δὲ τὸ
πρῶτον ὁρῶς αὐτὸν πεποι-
μέναι, κ. τ. λ.

and those who were the
most uneasy at the Breach
of the Laws, they disliked
what was done. They also
sent to the King [*Agrippa*] desiring him to send to *Ananus*
that he should act so no more, for that what he had al-
ready done could not be justified, &c.

About A. D. 360. *Ambrose or Hegesippus de Ex-
cid. Urb. Hierosolym. L. II. Cap. 12. See the
same in its much later Epitome also.*

*A Judæis æstimatum
comperimus & creditum
(auctore Josepho, adver-
sum se idoneo) quod non
fraude hominum, sed Dei
commotione Herodes exerci-
tum amiserit; & juste qui-
dem: propter vindictam
Joannis Baptistæ viri Ju-
sti, qui dixerat ei, Non
licet tibi fratris uxorem
habere, [Matt. xiv. 4. &
Mar. vi. 18.]*

We have discovered that
it was the Opinion and Be-
lief of the Jews, as *Josephus*
affirms, (who is an Author
not to be rejected, when he
writes against himself) that
Herod lost his Army, not by
the Deceit of Men; but by
the Anger of God; and that
justly, as an Effect of Re-
venge for what he did to
John the Baptist, a just Man,
who had said to him, *It is
not lawful for thee to have
thy Brother's Wife.*

*De Christo ipsi Judæi
quoque testantur, dicente
Josepho, historiarum scri-
ptore; quod fuerit illo tem-
pore vir sapiens, si tamen
oportet, inquit, virum dici,
mirabilium patratores o-
perum, qui apparuerit dis-
cipulis suis post triduum
mortis suæ vivens iterum,
secundum prophetarum scri-
pta; qui & hæc & alia
innumerabilia de eo plena
miraculis prophetaverunt,*

The Jews themselves also
bear Witness to *Christ*, as
appears by *Josephus* the Wri-
ter of their History, who
says thus, That there was at
that Time a wise Man, if,
says he, it be lawful to have
him called a Man, a Doer
of wonderful Works, who
appeared to his Disciples af-
ter the third Day, from his
Death, alive again; accord-
ing to the Writings of the
Prophets, who foretold these
and innumerable other mi-
raculous Events concerning
him.

quo capit congregatio
Christianorum, & in omne
dominum penetravit genus,
ut ulla natio Romani or-
bis remansit, quæ cultus
Christi expers relinqueretur.
Si nobis non credunt Judæi,
vel suis credant. Hoc dixit
Josephus, quem ipsi maxi-
mum putant. Et tamen
ita in eo ipso quod verum
locutus est, ita mente de-
clinavit, ut nec sermonibus
suis crederet, sed locutus
est propter historię suæ fi-
dem, quia fallere nefas pu-
tabat; non credidit propter
duritiem cordis, & perfidi-
æ intentionem. Non ta-
men veritati præjudicabat,
quod non credidit; sed plus
addidit testimonio, quod nec
incredulus & invitus ne-
gavit.

him. From whom began the
Congregation of Christians;
and hath penetrated among
all sorts of Men. Nor does
there remain any Nation in
the Roman World, which
continues Strangers to his
Religion. If the Jews do not
believe us, let them at least
believe their own Writers.
Josephus, whom they esteem
a very great Man, has said
this; and yet has he spoken
Truth after such a Manner,
and so far was his Mind
wander'd from the right way,
that even he was not a Be-
liever, as to what he him-
self said. But thus he spake
in order to deliver historical
Truth; because he thought
it not lawful for him to de-
ceive: while yet he was no
Believer, because of the
Hardness of his Heart, and
his perfidious Intention.

However, it was no Preju-
dice to the Truth that he was not a Believer; but this
adds more Weight to his Testimony, that while he was an
Unbeliever, and unwilling this should be true, he has not
denied it to be so.

About A. D. 400. Rufinus Verf. Hist. Eccl. Euseb.

Fuit autem iisdem tem-
poribus Jesus, sapiens vir,
tamen virum eum nomi-
nare fas est. Erat enim
mirabilium operum effector,
doctorque hominum eorum
qui libenter quæ vera sunt
audiunt. Et multos qui-
dem

Now there was at that
Time Jesus, a wise Man, if
at least it be lawful to call
him a Man: for he was a
Doer of wonderful Works,
a Teacher of such Men as
willingly hear the Truth.
He also drew over to him
many of the Jews, and many
of

dem Judæorum, multos etiam ex Gentilibus sibi adjunxit. Christus hic erat. Hunc, accusatione primorum nostræ gentis virorum, cum Pilatus in crucem agendum esse decrevisset, non deseruerunt hi qui ab initio eum dilexerant. Apparuit enim eis tertio die iterum vivus: secundum quod divinitus inspirati prophetae vel hæc vel alia de eo innumera miracula futura esse prædixerant. Sed & in hodiernum diem Christianorum, qui ab ipso nuncupati sunt, & nomen perseverat & genus.

of the Gentiles. He was Christ. And when Pilate, at the Accusation of the principal Men of our Nation, had decreed that he should be crucified, those that had loved him from the Beginning did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third Day, according to what the divinely inspired Prophets had foretold, that these and innumerable other Miracles should come to pass about him. Moreover both the Name and the Sect of Christians, who are denominated from him, continue in being to this Day.

About A. D. 400. Hieronym. de Vir. Illustr. in Josepho.

Josephus, in decimo octavo Antiquitatum Libro, manifestissime confitetur, propter magnitudinem signorum Christum a Phariseis interfectum; & Joannem Baptistam vere Prophetam fuisse; & propter interfectionem Jacobi Apostoli dirutam Hierosolymam. Scripsit autem de Domino in hunc modum: Eodem tempore fuit Jesus, vir sapiens, si tamen virum eum oportet dicere; erat enim mirabilem patrator operum

Josephus, in the XVIIIth Book of Antiquities, most expressly acknowledges, that Christ was slain by the Pharisees on Account of the Greatness of his Miracles; and that John the Baptist was truly a Prophet; and that Jerusalem was demolished on Account of the Slaughter of James the Apostle. Now he wrote concerning our Lord after this Manner: At the same Time there was Jesus, a wise Man, if yet it be lawful to call him a Man: for he was a Doer of wonderful Works,

m, Et doctores eorum qui
 enter vera suscipiunt :
 urimos quoque tam de Ju-
 eis, quam de Gentibus sui
 buit sectatores : Et crede-
 tur esse Christus. Cum
 e invidia nostrorum prin-
 cipum cruci eum Pilatus ad-
 xisset, nihilominus qui eum
 imum dilexerant perseve-
 verunt. Apparuit enim
 s tertia die vivens; multa
 et hæc Et alia mirabilia
 rminibus prophetarum de
 vaticinantibus. Et usque
 odie Christianorum gens,
 ab hoc sortita vocabulum,
 non defecit.

a Teacher of those who wil-
 lingly receive the Truth.
 He had many Followers both
 of the Jews, and of the Gen-
 tiles. He was believed to
 be Christ. And when, by
 the Envy of our principal
 Men, Pilate had condemned
 him to the Cross, this not-
 withstanding, those who had
 loved him at first persevered.
 For he appeared to them a-
 live on the third Day; as
 the Oracles of the Prophets
 had foretold many of these
 and other wonderful Things
 concerning him. And the
 Sect of Christians, so named
 from him, are not extinct
 at this Day.

About A. D. 410. Sophronii Versio Græca Hiero-
 nymi de Viris Illustribus.

Ἰωσήφ, ἐν τῷ ὀκτωκαι-
 κατῷ λόγῳ φανερώς ὁμο-
 λογεῖ, ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦν ση-
 ρεῖων ἡ Χρῆστος ἐσφάχθαι
 ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων. καὶ Ἰωάννην
 Βαπτιστὴν ἀληθῶς γεγενῆ-
 σθαι προφήτην. καὶ ὅτι
 φάσιν Ἰακώβῳ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ
 ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ πεπορευθῆναι.
 ὁ γράφει ὅτι καὶ πρὸς τὸν Κλεό-
 παν. Γίνεσθαι ὅτι καὶ τῶν
 ἁγίων Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ,
 καὶ ἄνδρες αὐτὸν λέγουσιν Χρισ-
 τὸν παρεδόξαν ἔργων ποι-
 ῆσαι, διδάσκαλόν ἀνθρώπων
 ἡδονῇ τάλανθῃ δεχομένων.
 πολλὰς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολ-
 λὰς

Josephus, in the XVIIIth
 Book of Antiquities, openly
 acknowledges that Christ was
 slain by the Pharisees, on
 Account of the Greatness of
 his Miracles; and that John
 the Baptist was truly a Pro-
 phet; and that Jerusalem
 was demolished on Account
 of the Slaughter of James
 the Apostle. He wrote also
 concerning our Lord after
 this Manner: About the
 same Time there was Jesus,
 a wise Man, if it be lawful
 to call him a Man: for he
 was a Doer of wonderful
 Works; a Teacher of such
 Men as receive the Truth
 with

λὺς ὃ καὶ τῷ Ἑλληνισμῷ ἐπη-
γάγετο. Ὁ Χριστὸς ἔτι ἦν.
Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων
ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν, τῶν αὐτῶν
ἐπιτετιμηκότων Πιλάτῳ, ὅτι
ἐπαύσατο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν
ἀγαπήσαντες· ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐ-
τοῖς τρίτην ἔχον ἡμέραν;
πάλιν ζῶν. Τῶν Θεῶν προ-
φητῶν ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλα μυρία
ἐπὶ αὐτῷ εἰρηκότων. εἴς τε νῦν
Χριστιανῶν, ὅσοι τῷδε ὠνα-
μασμένον, καὶ ἐλπίσι τὸ Φῶλον.

And the Tribe of *Christians*, so named from him, are
not extinct at this Day.

About A. D. 410. *Isidorus Pelusiota the Scholar*
of Chrysostom, L. IV. Epist. 225.

Εὐγένιος τις Ἰωσήφῳ Ἰε-
δαῖῳ ἀρετῷ, καὶ τῷ νόμῳ
ζηλωτῇ, καὶ τῷ παλαιᾷ δι-
αθήκῃ μετὰ ἀληθείας πα-
ραφράσας, καὶ ὑπὲρ Ἰε-
δαίου ἀρετῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν
κατὰ πάντα τε τὰ ἐκείνων
κρείττονα λόγῳ ὑποφαιών·
τῇδε τῷ πραγματικῶν ἀληθείας
παρεφωρησάμενος· καὶ
γὰρ ἐξήλωσε τῶν ἀσεβῶν καὶ
γνώμην, ἀναγκαῖον οἶμαι τὰς
ἐκείνους παρεστῆσθαι ῥήσεις. Τί
ἐν φησὶ; Γίνεται ὃ κατ' ἐ-
κείνον τὸ χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς
ἀνὴρ, εἶπε ἀνδρῶν αὐτὸν λέ-
γειν χρὴ· ἦν γὰρ παρεδόξων
ἔργων ποιητῆς, διδάσκαλῳ
ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τῶν ἀληθῶν
διχοκρινόμενων. καὶ πολλὰς μὲν
Ἰε-

There was one *Josephus*,
a *Jew* of the greatest Repu-
tation, and one that was zealous
of the Law: one also
that paraphrased the Old
Testament with Truth; and
acted valiantly for the *Jews*;
and had shewed that their
Settlement was nobler than
can be described by Words.
Now since he made their
Interest give Place to Truth;
for he would not support the
Opinion of impious Men, I
think it necessary to set down
his Words. What then
does he say? Now there
was about that Time *Jesus*,
a wise Man, if it be lawful
to call him a Man: for he
was a Doer of wonderful
Works, a Teacher of such
Men

δαίνε, ἀγάγε, ἢ ἢ ἔλ-
 λυκεῖ ἐπηγαγετο. ὁ Χρῖστος
 ἦν. καὶ αὐτὸν, ἐνδείξει
 πρῶτον ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν,
 αὐτῷ ἀπειρημένῳ Πιλά-
 τῳ, ἐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶ-
 τον ἀγαπήσαντες· ἐφάνη γὰρ
 αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν,
 τάλιν ζῶν. τῶν θεῶν προ-
 ρητῶν ταῦτά τε περὶ αὐτοῦ,
 καὶ ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια
 ἱερηκότων. ἴδε πόσον Χρῖστιανῶν
 ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου ὀνομασμένων ἐκ-
 τρέχει τὸ φύλον. Εγὼ δὲ
 λίαν θαυμάζω τ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν
 πολλοῖς μὴ τὸ φιλάλλητες,
 μάλιστα δὲ ἐν οἷς ἔπει, διδάσ-
 καλῶ ἀνθρώπων τ' ἡδονῇ
 τάλιῃ δεχομένων.

Men as receive the Truth
 with Pleasure. He drew over
 to him both many of the
Jews, and many of the *Gen-
 tiles*. He was the *Christ*.
 And when *Pilate*, at the
 Suggestion of the principal
 Men among us, had con-
 demned him to the Cross,
 those that loved him at first
 did not forsake him : For
 he appeared to them the
 Third Day alive again : As
 the Divine Prophets had said
 these, and a vast Number of
 other wonderful Things con-
 cerning him. And the Tribe
 of *Christians*, so named from
 him, are not extinct at this
 Day. Now I cannot but
 wonder greatly at this Man's
 Love of Truth in many Re-

spects : But chiefly where he says, “ *Jesus* was a Teacher
 “ of Men, which received the Truth with Pleasure.”

About A. D. 440. Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. I. 1. 8.

Καὶ Ἰωσήφῳ δὲ ὁ Ματ-
 θῆς, ὁ ἱερεὺς, ἀνὴρ πρῶτος τε
 Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ὑποδο-
 ξόταίῳ γινόμενῳ, ἀξιό-
 χρεως ἀν εἶναι μάρτυς τῷ πρὸς
 Χρῖστὸν ἀληθείας. ἀνδρα μὴ
 δὲ αὐτὸν ἀποκαλεῖν ὀκνεῖ, ὡς
 παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητὴν,
 καὶ διδάσκαλον λόγων ἀλη-
 θῶν, Χρῖστον δὲ πεφανώς
 ὀνομάζει· καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ κατα-
 δικαδοῦναι, καὶ τριτὴν ζῶν-
 τα φανῆναι, καὶ ἄλλα μυρία
 θαυμάσια περὶ αὐτοῦ προει-
 ρησθῆναι.

Now *Josephus* the Son of
Matthias, a Priest, a Man
 of very great Note both a-
 mong the *Jews* and the *Ro-
 mans*, may well be a Wit-
 ness of Credit, as to the
 Truth of *Christ's* History.
 For he scruples to call him
 a Man, as being a Doer of
 wonderful Works, and a
 Teacher of the Words of
 Truth. He names him
Christ openly : And is not
 ignorant that he was con-
 demned to the Cross, and
 appeared on the third Day
 alive,

ἐξ ὧν τοῖς θεοῖς προφῆταις
 ἐκ ἀγνοεῖ. πολλὰς ἢ ὅλως
 ἐς ἱππηγάγελον Ἑλλήνας τε καὶ
 Ἰσδαίους ἐπιμεῖναι ἀγαπῶν-
 τας αὐτὸν μαρτυρεῖ· καὶ τὸ
 ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὀνομασμένον μὴ
 ἐπιλείψαι φύλον. Καί μοι
 δοκεῖ ταῦτα ἰσορῶν μονογενὴς
 βοῶν, ἀναλόγως τοῖς ἔρσοις,
 Θεὸν εἶναι καὶ Χριστόν. ὑπὸ
 ἧ τῷ παραδόξῳ πρᾶγματι
 καταπλαγεῖς ὡς περὶ μέσους
 παρέδεξαμε, μηδὲν πῖς εἰς
 αὐτὸν πεισθίσασιν ἐπισκήψας,
 μᾶλλον ἢ σωθῆμεν.

Way; so as not to put any
 him; but rather to afford his

alive, and that a vast Num-
 ber of other wonderful Things
 were foretold of him by the
 Divine Prophets. He testi-
 fies also that those whom
 he drew over to him, being
 many of the *Gentiles*, as well
 as of the *Jews*, continued to
 love him, and that the Tribe
 named from him was not
 then extinct. Now he seems
 to me by this his Relation, al-
 most to proclaim that Christ
 is God. However he ap-
 pears to have been so af-
 fected with the Strangeness
 of the thing, as to run as if
 were in a Sort of a middle
 Indignity upon Believers in
 Suffrage to them.

About A. D. 510. Cassiodorus Hist. Tripartit. c.
 Sozomeno.

*Josephus autem Matta-
 thiae filius atque sacerdos,
 vir apud Judæos nobilissi-
 mus, nec non et apud Ro-
 manos dignissimus, erit te-
 stis de veritate Christi. Vo-
 care namque eum virum
 non audet, tanquam facto-
 rem insignium operum, ma-
 gistrumque sermonum vera-
 cium: Christum verò aperte
 nominat; et pœnæ crucis
 adjudicatum, et tertia die
 apparuisse vivum, et alia
 infinita miracula de eo a
 prophetis sanctis non igno-
 rat esse prædicta. Sed e-
 tiam*

Now *Josephus*, the Son of
Mattathias, and a Priest, a
 Man of great Nobility a-
 mong the *Jews*, and of
 great Dignity among the
Romans, shall be a Witness
 to the Truth of *Christ's* Hi-
 story. For he dares not call
 him a Man, as a Doer of
 famous Works, and a Tea-
 cher of true Doctrines. He
 names him *Christ* openly;
 and is not ignorant that he
 was condemned to the Cross,
 and appeared on the third
 Day alive, and that an infi-
 nite Number of other won-
 derful Things were foretold
 of him by the Holy Pro-
 phets.

*Etiam multos tunc extitisse
quos elegit Græcos atque
Judæos, Et in ejus per-
manere dilectione: Atque
gentem ab eo nominatam
nequaquam defecisse testa-
tur.*

phets. Moreover he testi-
fies also, that there were then
alive many whom he had
chosen, both *Greeks* and
Jews, and that they conti-
nued to love him, and that
the Sect which was named
from him was by no means
extinct at that time.

About A. D. 510. Epiphanius Scholasticus Verf.
Joseph. Lat. Antiq. XVIII. 6.

De Joanne Baptista.

*Quibusdam autem Judæ-
orum videbatur ideo peri-
sisse Herodis exercitum, quod
in eum satis juste indigna-
tio divina commota sit,
pro vindictâ Joannis qui
vocabatur Baptista: Hunc
enim Herodes occidit, vi-
rum valde bonum, qui præ-
cipiebat Judæis virtuti ope-
ram dare, justitiam colere,
in Deum servare pietatem,
Et per Baptismum in unum
coire: Tum demum enim
Baptismum acceptabile fore,
si non solum ad abluenda
peccata sumatur, verum e-
tiam ad castimoniam corpo-
ris, atque ad animæ justi-
tiam purificationemque ser-
vetur: Omniumque pariter
virtutum velut signaculum
Et custodia quædam fidelis
babeatur. Quæ cum ab eo
præcepta hujusmodi doce-
rentur, atque ad audiendum
eum*

Of John the Baptist.

It was the Opinion of
some of the *Jews*, that *He-
rod's* Army did therefore pe-
rish, because the Divine In-
dignation was kindled against
him, and that very just-
ly, by way of Vengeance
for *John*, who was called
the Baptist. For *Herod* had
slain him, who was a very
good Man, and commanded
the *Jews* to follow Virtue,
to exercise Righteousness, to
observe Piety towards God,
and to unite together by
Baptism: Because that then
would Baptism be a thing ac-
ceptable, if it be made use
of not only for the washing
away of Sins, but be obser-
ved also for the Purity of
the Body, and for the Righ-
teousness and Purification of
the Soul; and if it be looked
upon as a Seal of all the
Virtues together; and after
a Sort, a faithful Guardian
to them. Which Kind of
Precepts, when they were
taught

eum, per plurima multitudo concurreret, veritus Herodes ne forte doctrinæ ejus persuasione populi a suo regno discederent: (videbat enim quod præceptis ejus ac monitis parata esset plebs in omnibus obedire,) melius credidit priusquam novi aliquid fieret prævenire hominem nece, quam postmodum turbatis rebus seram pœnitundinem gerere. Ex solâ hâc suspitione Herodis vinctus in castellum Machærunta abducitur Joannes, ibique obtruncatur. Judæis autem, sicut jam diximus, videbatur pro ejus ultione interitum illius exercitui Deum importasse, quo Herodis sumpsisset digna supplicia.

tion upon his Army, in thereby inflicted a just Punishment upon Herod.

De Domino Jesu Christo.

Fuit autem eisdem temporibus Jesus, sapiens vir, si tamen virum eum nominare fas est. Erat enim mirabilium operum effector, & doctor hominum eorum qui libenter quæ vera sunt audiunt, & multos quidem Judæorum, multos etiam ex Gentilibus sibi adjunxit. Christus hic erat: Hunc, accusatione primo-

taught by him, and a very great Concourse of People came to hear him; Herod being afraid lest by the Persuasion of his Doctrine the People should depart from his Government; (for he saw that the common People were ready to obey the Precepts and Admonitions he gave them in all Points,) he thought it would be the best Way to prevent this Man before any Sedition should arise, by slaying him, than after Disturbances should happen, to repent when it might be too late. Upon this Suspicion alone of Herod's it was that John was sent a Prisoner to the Castle Machærus, and was there beheaded. But as we said just now, the Jews were of Opinion that God had brought Destruction way of Revenge; and had

Of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Now there was at that Time Jesus, a wise Man, if at least it be lawful to call him a Man: For he was a Doer of wonderful Works, a Teacher of such Men as willingly hear the Truth. He also drew over to him many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was Christ. And when Pilate, at the Accusation of the principal Men of our Nation,

nam nostræ gentis virorum, cum Pilatus in crucem agenda esse decrevisset, non deseruerunt hi qui ab initio eum dilexerunt. Apparuit enim eis tertia die, iterum vivus: Secundum quod divinitus inspirati prophetae vel hæc vel alia de eo innumera miracula futura esse prædixerant. Sed & in hodiernum Christianorum, qui ab ipso nuncupati sunt, & nomen persequerantur & genus.

tion, had decreed that he should be crucified, those that loved him from the beginning did not forsake him: for he appeared to them the third Day alive again; according to what the divinely inspired Prophets had foretold, that these and innumerable other Miracles should come to pass about him. Moreover both the Name and the Sect of Christians, who were denominated from him, continue in being to this Day.

XX. 16. De Jacobo, fratre Domini, lapidato sub Anano Pontifice.

Of James the Brother of our Lord, who was stoned under Ananus the High Priest.

Ananus credens se invenisse tempus opportunum, Festo mortuo, & Albino in itinere constituto, concilium fecit Judicum, & quosdam deducens ad semet ipsum; inter quos & fratrem Jesu, qui dicitur Christus, nomine Jacobum, quasi contra legem agentes, accusans, tradidit lapidandos. Qui autem videbantur moderatissimi esse civitatis, & circa legis integritatem habere sollicitudinem, graviter hoc tulere; miseruntque latenter ad regem, rogantes eum ut scriberet Anano ne talia perpetraret;

Ananus, believing that he had found out a proper Time [to exercise his Authority,] Festus being dead, and Albinus only upon the Road, he appointed a Council of Judges: And bringing some before him, among whom was the Brother of Jesus who is called Christ, whose Name was James, he accused them as acting against the Law, and delivered them up to be stoned. But those of the Citizens that seemed the most moderate, and were concerned to have the Law exactly observed, were greatly offended; and sent to the King [Agrippa,] intreating him that he would write

petraret; cum neque prius recte fecisset, &c.

to *Ananus*, that he should not perpetrate such Things: Since what he had already done was not well done by him, &c.

About A. D. 640. Chron. Alex. p. 514.

Ισορεῖ ὅτι καὶ Ἰωσήπ[Ⓞ] ἐν
 τῇ τ' ἀρχαιολογίᾳ αὐτῆς βί-
 βλῳ, ὡς ἀπὸ Ἡρωδιάδα,
 γυναικα ἔσαν Φιλίππου ἀδελ-
 φῶ αὐτῆς τῆς Ἡρώδης, ὁ ἅγι[Ⓞ]
 Ἰωάννης ὑποτίμνε. ἀπετίσας
 ὅτι ἐτι ζῶσαν καὶ προτέρην
 αὐτῆς γυναικα ὁ Ἡρώδης,
 καὶ νόμος αὐτῷ γελαμνημένην,
 Ἀρέτα ὅτι ἦν αὐτῇ τῆς Πε-
 τρέων βασιλέως θυγατήρ, καὶ
 ὅτι Ἡρωδιάδα ἐτι ζῶν[Ⓞ]
 ἀφαιρήσας τῆς ἀνδρὸς, δι' ἣν
 καὶ τὸ Ἰωάννην ἀνείλεν, πό-
 λεμον αἰρεῖται ὁ Ἀρέτας
 πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην, ὡς ἡτί-
 μασμένης αὐτῆς τὸ θυγατρὸς.
 ἐν ᾧ πολέμῳ πάντῃ φασί
 τὸν Ἡρώδην στρατὸν ἀφθι-
 κρῆναι· καὶ ταῦτα πεπον-
 θέναι, τὸ ὁπλοῦν ἕνεκα τὸ
 ἡγομένης καὶ τῆς Ἰωάννης. ὁ ὅτι
 αὐτὸς Ἰωσήπ[Ⓞ] ἰσορεῖ τῆς
 βασιλείας ἀποπεπλωκέναι καὶ
 Ἡρώδην ἀπὸ τῆς Ἡρωδιάδα,
 μετ' ἧς αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ ὑπερ-
 ολίαν ἀπεληλλάδης Λυδόνον.
 κ. τ. λ.

Now *Josephus* also relates, in the 18th Book of Anti-
 quities, how *John the Bap-
 tist*, that Holy Man, was
 beheaded on Account of *He-
 rodias*, the Wife of *Philip*
 the Brother of *Herod* him-
 self. For *Herod* had divor-
 ced his former Wife, who
 was still alive, and had been
 his lawful Wife; she was
 the Daughter of *Aretas*,
 King of the *Petreeans*. When
 therefore *Herod* had taken
Herodias away from her Hus-
 band, while he was yet a-
 live, on whose Account he
 slew *John* also, *Aretas* made
 War against *Herod*, because
 his Daughter had been disho-
 nourably treated. In which
 War he says that all *He-
 rod's* Army was destroyed,
 and that he suffered that
 Calamity because of the
 Wickedness he had been
 guilty of against *John*. The
 same *Josephus* relates, that
Herod lost his Kingdom on
 Account of *Herodias*; and
 that with her he was ba-
 nished to *Lyons*, &c.

Ἐπεὶ ὅτι τρεῖς
 ἐνιαυτοὺς ὁ σωτὴρ
 ἐδίδαξε τὸ κήρυγμα, δεικνύσαι
 καὶ

Now that our Saviour
 taught his Preaching three
 Years, is demonstrated both

by

ἡ ἐξ ἐτέρων ἀναγκαίων λό-
γων, ἐκτε τῶν ἱερῶν διαγε-
νῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἰωσήφου τῶ
πατρὸς Εβραίοις σοφῶ γραφέν-
των· κ. τ. λ.

C. II. § 2. Ο Ἰωσήφ, ἐν τῷ 18-
ταύτης ἀρχαιολογίας, γρά-
φει, τρεῖς ἀρχιερεῖς μὲν τῶν
Ἰσραὴλ γένοναι· Ἰσμάηλον τῶν
Βαφεί· καὶ Ελεάζαρον τῶν
Ανάν· καὶ Σίμωνα τῶν
Καμαθεί· κ. τ. λ.

Ἰωσήφ 150-
p. 584, 586. ρεῖ, ἐν τῷ πέμπ-
τῳ λόγῳ τῶν αἰώσεως, ὅτι
ἐπὶ τῇ τρίτῃ Οὐεσπασιανῇ ἡ
ἄλωσις τῶν Ἰουδαίων γέγονεν,
ὡς μὲν μὴ ἐπὶ τῇ, τῇ ἡγομένης
παρὰ αὐτῶν πόλεως καὶ τῇ
Ἰησῶ· ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ φησὶ καὶ
Ἰάκωβον τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν Κυ-
ρίων καὶ ἐπισκοπὸν Ἱεροσολύ-
μων ἡγομένην ὑπὸ αὐτῶν
κρημνηθῆναι, καὶ ὑπὸ αὐτῶν
ἀναιρεθῆναι λιθοβοληθέντα.

Vid. Hegesip. apud Grabe Spicileg. Tom. II. p. 207, 208.

N. B. These Passages in the *Chronicon*, look as if its Author had somewhat about *James* in his Copy of *Josephus's* Fifth Book of the War of the *Jews*, which our present Copies afford us not. Nay that he here refers to the famous Passage concerning *Christ* himself, which we do not now find cited by him: as any one would expect it should have been, by all other Circumstances. I confess I suspect a little, that the Author himself at first designed to insert that Testimony in the Place of the Repetition of *Phlegon's* Testimony of the Eclipse at *Christ's* Passion, which he had set down a little before, and which was not to his present Purpose, but contradicted

by other necessary Reasonings, as also out of the Holy Gospels, and out of *Josephus's* Writings: who was a wise Man among the *Hebrews*, &c.

Now *Josephus*, in the 18th Book of *Jewish* Antiquities, writes, that after *Annas* there were three High Priests; *Ismael* the Son of *Baphi*; and *Eleazar* the Son of *Ananus*; and *Simon* the Son of *Camathi*, &c.

Josephus relates, in the 5th Book of the [*Jewish*] War, that *Jerusalem* was taken in the third [second] Year of *Vespasian*: As after 40 Years since they had dared to put *Jesus* to Death. In which time he says, that *James* the Brother of our Lord, and Bishop of *Jerusalem*, was thrown down [from the Temple] and slain of them, by stoning.

tradicted it : Though in transcribing his Papers, that Testimony was forgotten to be transcribed, and that of Phlegon was a second Time transcribed in its Place. *Judicent Eruditi.*

About A. D. 740. Anastasias Abbas contr. Jud.

*Jam Josephus, auctor
Et scriptor vester, de Christo
ait, fuisse virum justum Et
bonum, divinâ gratiâ osten-
sum ac declaratum, qui
plurimos signis Et miracu-
lis juvaret.*

Now Josephus, an Author
and Writer of your own,
says of Christ, that he was
a just and good Man; shew-
ed and declared so to be by
Divine Grace; who gave
Aid to many by Signs and
Miracles.

About A. D. 790. Georgius Syncellus Chron.
p. 339.

Ἰωσήφου περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν.

Out of Josephus concerning
the same.

Ταῦτα συμβέβηκεν Ἰουδαί-
οις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου ὁ
δικαίου, ὃς ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ
τῷ λεγομένῳ Χριστῷ· ἐπειδὴ
ὅτι δικαιοτάτον αὐτὸν ὄντα
Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπέκτειναν — ἅτε ὁ
τοιοῦτος ὁ Ἀνανῶς νομίσας
ἔχειν καιρὸν θανάτου, καὶ
τὸ τεθνᾶναι μὴ Φῆσον, Ἀλ-
βινόν τινι καὶ ὁδὸν ὑπάρ-
χειν, καθίζει σιωδελιον κρι-
τῶν, καὶ παραλαβὼν εἰς αὐ-
τὸ ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ ὁ Χριστὸς
λεγομένον, Ἰακώβον ὀνόμα
αὐτῷ, καὶ τινὰς ἐταίρους, ὡς
καταπαρενομισάντων κατηγο-
ρίαν ποιησάμενος, παραδέ-
δωκεν καταλαβόμενον. ὅσοι
τὸ ἰδοῦν ἐπικρίναι τὸ καὶ
†

These Miseries befel the
Jews by way of Revenge
for James the Just, who was
the Brother of Jesus that
was called Christ; on the
Account that they had slain
him, who was a most righ-
teous Person ----- Now as
Ananus, a Person of that
Character, thought he had
a proper Opportunity, be-
cause Jesus was dead, and
Albinus was but upon the
Road, so he assembles the
Sanhedrim of Judges, and
brings before them James,
the Brother of Jesus who
was called Christ; and some
of his Companions; and
when he had formed an Ac-
cusation against them, as
Breakers

πολιν εἶναι, καὶ τὰ πάλαι
νόμους ἀκριβεῖς, βαρέως
ἐκείκον ὑπὸ τῶν, καὶ πέμ-
ψαντες πρὸς τὴν βασιλέα κρυφῶς,
κατακαλῦντες αὐτὸν ἐπισεί-
λαι τῷ Ανάνῳ μηκέτι τοιαῦ-
τα πράττειν, μηδὲ ὅτι τὸ
πρώτον ὁρθῶς πεποιθέναι·
καὶ τ. λ.

Breakers of the Law, he delivered them to be stoned. But as for those that seemed the most equitable of the Citizens, and those that were the most uneasy at the Breach of the Laws, they disliked what was done. They also sent to the King [Agrippa] desiring him to send to *Ananus* that he should

do so no more: For that what he had already done could not be justified, &c.

About A. D. 840. Freculphus Lexovienfis Chron. II. 5. ex Hieronymi Versione.

Josephus, in XVIII Antiquitatum Libro, manifestissime confitetur propter magnitudinem signorum Christum a Phariseis interfectum; & Johannem Bapt. vere prophetam fuisse; & propter interfectionem Jacobi Apostoli Hierosolymam dirutam. Scripsit autem de Domino in hunc modum: Eo tempore fuit Jesus, sapiens vir, si tamen virum eum oportet dicere: erat autem mirabilium patrator operum, & doctor eorum qui libenter vera suscipiunt: plurimos quoque tam de Judæis quam de Gentibus sui habuit sectatores, & credebatur Christus: cumque invidia nostrorum principum cruci
eum

Josephus, in the 18th Book of Antiquities, most expressly acknowledges that Christ was slain by the Pharisees on Account of the Greatness of his Miracles; that John the Baptist was truly a Prophet, and that Jerusalem was demolished on Account of the Slaughter of James the Apostle. Nay he wrote concerning our Lord after this Manner: At that time there was Jesus, a wise Man, if it be reasonable to call him a Man: For he was a Doer of wonderful Works, and a Teacher of those who willingly receive the Truth. He had many Followers, both of the Jews and of the Gentiles. He was also believed to be Christ. And when, by the Envy of our principal Men, Pilate had condemned him to the Cross,
F this

eum Pilatus addixisset, nihilominus qui eum dilexerunt perseverarunt in eo. Apparuit autem ei tertio die vivens: multa hæc & alia mirabilia carminibus prophetarum de eo vaticantibus: & usque hodie gens ab hoc vocabulum sortita non defecit.

this notwithstanding those who loved him at first persevered. Now he appeared to them on the third Day alive: As the Oracles of the Prophets had foretold many of these, and of other wonderful Things concerning him. And the Sect of *Christians*, so named from him, are not extinct at this Day.

About A. D. 850. Johan. Malela Chron. L. X.

Ἐξ ἐκείνης ὁλεθεῖ ἡ ἑ-
ξαλο πῖς Ἰουδαίοις, καθὼς
ἸωσήπⓈ ὁ Ἑβραίων φιλό-
σοφⓈ ταῦτα συγέγραψε.
εἰρηκῶς καὶ τῷτο, ὅτι ἐξ ἧ
Ἰουδαῖοι ἐσαύρωσαν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς
ἦν ἀνθρώπⓈ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δί-
καιⓈ, (εἴπερ ἄρα τὸ ποιῶ-
τον ἀνθρώπον δεῖ λέγειν, καὶ
μὴ Θεόν) ἔκ ἐξέλειψεν ὁδύνη
ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας χώρας. ταῦ-
τα ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίκοις συγ-
γρᾶμμασιν αὐτῷ ἐξέθετο ὁ
αὐτὸς ἸωσήπⓈ ἸουδαῖⓈ.

From that time began the Destruction of the *Jews*, as *Josephus*, the Philosopher of the *Hebrews*, has written: Who also said this, that from the Time the *Jews* crucified *Christ*, who was a good and a righteous Man, (that is, if it be fit to call such an one a Man, and not a God,) the Land of *Judæa* was never free from Trouble. These Things the same *Josephus* the *Jew* has related in his Writings.

About A. D. 860. Photius Cod. XLVIII.

Ἀνελνώσθη ἸωσήπⓈ περὶ τῶ
παντὸς, ὃ ἐν ἄλλοις ἀνέγ-
νων ὑπερβαλλόμενον περὶ τῶ
παντὸς ὑσίας. ἔστι δὲ ἐν δυ-
οὶ λοισιδίοις. — διέξεισι περὶ
τῆς κοσμογονίας κεφαλαιωδῶς,
περὶ μὲντοι Χριστοῦ τῆς ἀληθι-
νῆς Θεῶς ἡμῶν ὡς ἐγγίσα Θεο-
λογεῖ· κληῖσιν τε αὐτὴν ἀνα-
φειλόμηνⓈ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐν
πατρὸς

I have read the Treatise of *Josephus* about the *Universe*. Whose Title I have elsewhere read to be, *Of the Substance of the Universe*. It is contained in two very small Treatises. --- He treats of the Origin of the World in a brief Manner. However, he speaks of the Divinity of *Christ*, who is our

true

αὐτὸς ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἡγόνησι ἀ-
μύπητος ἀναγραφῶν· ὁ τινὰς
ὡς καὶ ἀμφιδοξῆεν ὡς Ἰωσή-
φ· εἴη τὸ συναίσματιον ἀνα-
είσεν· καὶ δὲν ἢ τὸ τ' φε-
ρῶς αὐτῷ πρὸς τὰ ὑπόλοι-
πα τῷ ἀνδρὶ δοκεῖ. ἔνρον
ἐν παραρρηματίᾳ ὅτι ἐκ ἐστὶν
λόγῳ Ἰωσήφ, ἀλλὰ Γαί-
ου πρεσβυτέρου.

true God, in a way very
like to what we use, de-
claring the same Name of
Christ belongs to him, and
writes of his ineffable Ge-
neration of the Father after
such a Manner, as cannot
be blamed. Which thing
may perhaps raise a Doubt
in some, whether *Josephus*
were the Author of the
Work? though the Phrase-

ology does not at all differ from this Man's other Works.
However, I have found in some Papers, that this Discourse
was not written by *Josephus*, but by one *Caius*, a Presbyter.

Cod. CCXXXVIII. Ηρώ-
δης ὁ τετραρχὴς Γαλιλαίας
καὶ Περαιάς, παῖς Ηρώδου τῷ
μεγάλου, ἡρώδου, ὡς Ἰωσή-
φός φησιν, ἀδελφὸς Ηρώδου
φωαῖκα, ὄνομα Ηρωδιάδα·
ὑπόγονον δ' ἦν αὐτῇ τῷ
μεγάλου Ηρώδου, Αριστοβύλῳ
τῷ παιδί, ὃν ἐκείνῳ ἀνέειλε
γεννημένη. ἦν δ' αὐτῇ καὶ ὁ
ἀδελφὸς Ἀγρίππας. ταύ-
τῃ Ηρώδης τῷ ἀνδρὶ Διψή-
σας ἡγάγετο γυναῖκα. ὅπως
ὁ τ' μέγαν ἀνελὼν Ἰωάν-
νου, τ' πρόδρομον, δεδιὼς
(Ἰωσήφός φησι) μὴ τὸ ἐθνὸν
αὐτῷ Διψήσῃ· πάντες γὰρ δι'
ὑπερβολῇ ἀρετῆς Ἰωάννου
λόγους [f. λόγοις] εἰποῖτο. καὶ
ἔπειτα καὶ τὸ σωτήριον ἐγεγό-
ρει πάντῳ.

Herod the Tetrarch of
Galilee and of *Peræa*, the
Son of *Herod* the Great, fell
in love, as *Josephus* says,
with the Wife of his Bro-
ther *Herod*, whose Name was
Herodias, who was the
Grand-daughter of *Herod*
the Great, by his Son *Ari-
stobulus*, whom he had slain.
Agrippa was also her Bro-
ther. Now *Herod* took her
away from her Husband,
and married her. This is
he that slew *John the Bap-
tist*, that great Man, the
Forerunner [of *Christ*] be-
ing afraid (as *Josephus* says)
lest he should raise a Sedi-
tion among his People: For
they all followed the Di-
rections of *John*, on Ac-
count of the Excellency of
his Virtue. In his Time was
the Passion of our Saviour.

Cod. XXXIII. Ανεκλάσθη
Ἰσὺς Τιβεριέως χρονικόν· —
Τὰ πλεῖστα τῶ ἀνακαιοτάτων
ᾠδῶν.

I have read the Chronicle
of *Iustus* of *Tiberias*. He
omits the greatest Part of
what was most necessary to

παρετρέχων, ὡς ἡ τὰ Ἰουδαίων νοσῶν, Ἰουδαῖός τε καὶ αὐτὸς τὸς ὑπάρχων τὸ γένος, καὶ Χριστὸς παρυσίας, καὶ τὸ πρὸ αὐτὸν τελεοθέντων, καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ αὐτῶν τερατουργηθέντων ἐδενὸς ὅλως μνημῶν ἐποιήσατο.

be related : But, as infected with Jewish Prejudices, being also himself a Jew by Birth, he makes no mention at all of the Advent, or of the Acts done, or of the Miracles wrought by Christ.

The Time uncertain. Macarius in Actis Sanctorum, Tom. V. p. 149. ap. Fabric. Joseph. p. 61.

Ἰωσήφ, ὁ ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεὺς γένους, καὶ ἰσοριῶν μετ' ἀληθείας τὰ καὶ Ἰουδαίους, μαρτυρεῖ καὶ Χριστὸν, καὶ ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν γεγονότα, ἐνανθρωπήσαντά τε, καὶ σωρωθέντα, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθέντα καὶ τὰ συγγραμματα ἐν τῇ δημοσίᾳ ἀπὸκειν, βιβλιοθήκῃ. λέγει ἡ ἑξῆς.

Γίνετο ἡ καὶ τῶν καίρων Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἷγεν ἄνδρες αὐτὸν λέγειν καὶ ἦν ὃς καὶ ἀδόξων ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἡδονῇ τὰ ἀληθῆ δεχομένων. καὶ πολλὰ μὲν Ἰουδαίων, πολλὰς καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπέγειρο. ὁ Χριστὸς ἔστω ἦν. καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν, σωρῶν δὲ πειρημηκότος Πιλάτου, ἐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαπήσαντες. ἐφάνη ὃς αὐτοῖς τρίτῃ ἔχων ἡμέραν, πάλλιν ζῶν. καὶ θείων προφητῶν ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλα μυστῆρα θαύματα πρὸ αὐτῶν εἰρηκότων. καὶ

Josephus, a Priest of Jerusalem, and one that wrote with Truth the History of the Jewish Affairs, bears Witness, that Christ, the true God, was incarnate, and crucified, and the third Day rose again : Whose Writings are reposit in the publick Library : Thus he says,

Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise Man, if it be lawful to call him a Man : For he was a Doer of wonderful Works, a Teacher of such Men as receive the Truth with Pleasure. He also drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. This was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the Suggestion of the principal Men among us, had condemned him to the Cross, those that loved him at first did not forsake him. For he appeared to them the third Day alive again, as the Divine Prophets had said these and a vast

ἐκείνι νῦν Χριστιανόν, ὅτι
 ὁ ἀνομασμήλον, ἐκ ἐπέλιπε
 ἵλον. Ταῦτα ἔν τῷ ἔ
 αίων γεγραμμένως πάλαι
 ἐαυτῷ βίβλοις ἔχοντες
 οὐδὲ τῷ δεσπότῃ καὶ
 σωτῆρι ἡμῶν, ποῖα ἄρα
 ἀπολογία τοῖς ἀπίστοις ὑπο-
 στήσεται;

vast Number of other won-
 derful Things concerning
 him. And the Tribe of
Christians, so named from
 him, are not extinct at this
 Day. Since therefore the
 Writer of the *Hebrews* has
 engraven this Testimony con-
 cerning our Lord and Sa-
 viour in his own Books,
 what Defence can there re-
 main for the Unbelievers?

About A. D. 980. Suidas in voce Ἰησῦς.

Εὐρόμῳ Ἰώσηπον ὁ συγ-
 γραφέας τῆς ἀλώσεως Ἱεροσο-
 λύμων, (ὃ μνήμῳ πολλὴν
 Εὐσέβιου ὁ Παμφύλῃς ἐν τῇ
 Ἐκκλησιαστικῇ αὐτῷ ἱστορίᾳ
 ποιῆται,) φανερώς λέγοντα,
 ἐν τοῖς τῷ Αἰχμαλωσίας αὐτῷ
 ὑπομνήμασιν, ὅτι Ἰησῦς ἐν
 τῷ ἱερῷ μὲν ἱερέων ἡγίασε.
 τῷτο ἔν ἐυρόντες λέγοντα τὸν
 Ἰώσηπον, ἀνδρα δ' ἄρχαον ὄν-
 τα, καὶ ὃ μὲν πολλῶ χρόνον ἔ
 ὀπισθίων ἡρόμῳ, κ. τ. λ.

We have found *Josephus*,
 who has written about the
 taking of *Jerusalem*, (of whom
Eusebius Pamphili makes fre-
 quent mention, in his Ec-
 cleastical History,) saying
 openly in his *Memoirs of the*
Captivity, that *Jesus* offici-
 ated in the Temple with the
 Priests. This we have found
Josephus saying: A Man of
 ancient Times, and not
 very long after the Apo-
 stles, &c.

In voce Ἰώσηπου e Versione Hieronym. per So-
 phronium.

Ἰώσηπου Ἰσδαίου, φιλαλ-
 ήτης, λέγων περὶ τῷ προ-
 δρόμῳ, καὶ περὶ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν
 καὶ Θεῷ καὶ Σωτῆρι Ἰησῷ Χρι-
 στῷ. — ἔστι ἐν τῇ ὀκτωκαι-
 δεκάτῃ τῆς Ἀρχαιολογίας
 βίβλῳ φανερώς ὁμολογεῖ, διὰ
 τὸ ὅγκον τῶν σημείων καὶ Χρι-
 στὸν ἐσφάχθαι παρὰ Ἰσδαίων.

Josephus the Jew, that
 Lover of Truth, speaks of
 the Forerunner [of *Christ*]
 and of our Lord and God
 and Saviour *Jesus Christ*. ---
 He in the 18th Book of
 Antiquities openly acknow-
 ledges that *Christ* was slain
 by the Jews, on Account of
 the Greatness of his Mira-
 cles;

ἡ Ἰωάννου ὁ Βαπτιστὴς αἰλη-
θῶς γενηθεὶς προφήτης· ἡ
Δὲ ὁ σφαγὴν Ἰακώβου τῆς
Αποστόλου τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα πε-
πορευθεὶς. γράφει ὁ παῖς τῆς
Κυρίας Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡμῶν ὡ-
τως.

Γίνετο ὁ Χρ. τῆτον ὁ χρο-
νον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε
ἀνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν Χρῆ-
στὸν ὃν ὁ πατριάρχων ἔργων ποι-
ητὴς, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώ-
πων ὃν ἡδονὴ τἀληθῆ δεχο-
μένων. ἡ πολλὰς τῶν Ἰουδαί-
ων, πολλὰς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλη-
νικῶν ἐπεγάγετο. ὁ Χριστὸς ὤ-
κει ἦν. ἡ αὐτὸν, ἐνδείξει
τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡ-
μῖν, σαυρῶν ὑπελιμνηκότων
Πιλάτου, ἐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ
πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες·
ἐφάνη δὲ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἡ-
μέραν, πάλιν ζῶν. τῶν
θεῶν προφητῶν ταῦτα, ἡ
ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυ-
μαστὰ εἰρηκότων. εἰς τε νῦν τὸ
τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὅπου τῶδε ὡ-
νομασμένων, ἐκ ἀπελείπετο
φύλον.

cles; and that *John the Baptist* was truly a Prophet, and that *Jerusalem* was de-
molished on Account of the
Slaughter of *James the Apo-*
stle. Nay he wrote also
concerning our Lord *Jesus*
Christ after this Manner:

Now about the same time
there was *Jesus*, a wise Man,
if it be lawful to call him a
Man: For he was a Doer
of wonderful Works, a Tea-
cher of such Men as receive
the Truth with Pleasure.
He drew over to him both
many of the *Jews*, and ma-
ny of the *Gentiles*. This
was the *Christ*. And when
Pilate, at the Suggestion of
the principal Men among
us, had condemned him to
the Cross, those that had
loved him at the first did
not forsake him: For he
appeared to them the third
Day alive again: As the
Divine Prophets had said
these, and a vast Number
of other wonderful Things
concerning him. And the
Tribe of *Christians*, so na-
med from him, are not ex-
tinct at this Day.

About A. D. 1060. Cedrenus Compend. Histor.
p. 196.

Γράφει Ἰωσήπος περὶ μὲν
Ἰωάννη τῶν Βαπτιστῶν ταῦτα·
Τισὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐδόκει διο-
λωλέναι τὴν Ἡρώδου στρατὸν
ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, ἡ μάλα δίκαιαν

τινὴν

Josephus does indeed write
concerning *John the Baptist*
as follows: Some of the
Jews thought that the De-
struction of *Herod's Army*
came from God; and that
he

συμφέρει δίκην, ἅθ' ποι-
 ῶν Ἰωάννης τῷ καλυμμένῳ
 ἐπιτίθη· τὸν γὰρ Ἡρώδης
 εἶναι, ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ
 οὗτος Ἰουδαίοις κελεύοντα ἀρε-
 τῇ ἐπασκῆν, καὶ τῇ πρὸς
 ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τῇ
 πρὸς Θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ χρῆσθαι.
 σιωπῆσαι βαπτισμὸν. [f.
 σωπῆσαι βασισμῶ] Περὶ
 τῷ Χρυσῷ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς
 φησιν, ὅτι ἡ καὶ τὸ καιρὸν τῷ
 Ἰησοῦς, ὁ σοφὸς ἄνθρωπος ἦν,
 ὅγε ἄνδρα λέγειν αὐτὸν ἔχ-
 ομεν. ἦν γὰρ θαυμάσιος ἐργῶν
 ποιητής, καὶ διδάσκαλος ἀν-
 θρώπων ὅτι ἐν ἡδονῇ τάλανθῃ
 δεχομένων. πολλὰς γὰρ καὶ ἀπὸ
 Ἑλλήνων ἠγάγετο Χρυσός· ὃν
 Πιλάτης σταυρώσαντι, ἐκ ἐ-
 παύσαντο κηρύσσοντες πρὸς αὐ-
 τοὺς οἱ τὸ πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγα-
 πῆσαντες μαθηταί· ἐφάνη γὰρ
 αὐτοῖς τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔχων,
 πάλιν ζῶν. τῶν θείων προ-
 φητῶν ταῦτά τε, καὶ ἄλλα
 μαρτυρησάντων πρὸς αὐτὸν θαυ-
 μάσια, καὶ εἰρηκότων.

Αὐτὸν παρέξομεν
 p. 231. ὅτι Ἰωσήπον μάρτυρα,
 τὸν τὰ Ἰουδαίων φρονεῖν, —
 Σὺ δέ μοι σκόπει τὸ φιλάλη-
 θες τῷ ἀνδρὶ, ὅς, εἰ καὶ Ἰου-
 δαῖος ἦν, ἐκ ἡνέχετο ζηλω-
 ται ὅτι Ἰουδαίῳ φιλονεικίαν
 τε καὶ ψευδοθερίαν. [Vid.
 Chrysost. inter Testimo-
 nia Iosepho præfixa : a
 quo hæc verba fere acci-
 piuntur.] About

he was punished very justly
 for what Punishment he had
 inflicted on *John*, that was
 called the *Baptist* : For *He-
 rod* slew him, who was a
 good Man, and commanded
 the *Jews* to exercise Virtue,
 both by Righteousness to-
 wards one another, and Pie-
 ty towards God ; and so to
 come to Baptism. But as
 concerning *Christ*, the same
Josephus says, that about that
 Time there was *Jesus*, a
 wise Man, if it be lawful to
 call him a Man : For he was
 a Doer of wonderful Works,
 and a Teacher of such Men
 as receive the Truth with
 Pleasure. For that *Christ*
 drew over many even from
 the *Gentiles*. Whom when
Pilate had crucified, those
 who at first had loved him
 did not leave off to preach
 concerning him : For he
 appeared to them the third
 Day alive again, as the
 Divine Prophets had testified
 and spoken these and other
 wonderful Things concern-
 ing him.

We will produce *Josephus*
 himself for a Witness ; who
 was of the Sect of the
Jews.---- Consider the Love
 of Truth that was in this
 Man ; who although he were
 a *Jew*, yet did he not per-
 mit himself to follow the
Jewish Evasions and False-
 hood.]

About A. D. 1080. Theophylact. in Joan XIII.

Ἡ πόλις Ἰουδαίων ἑάλω,
καὶ ἡ θεήλαϊ Ⓞ ὀργὴ κατ' αὐ-
τῶν ἐφύετο· ὡς καὶ Ἰωσήφ Ⓞ
μαρτυρεῖ, ὅτι τὸ θάνατον τῷ
Ἰησοῦ ταῦτα αὐτοῖς γυνέετο.

The City of the *Jews* was
taken, and the Wrath of
God was kindled against
them: As also *Josephus* wit-
nesses, that this came upon
them on Account of the
Death of *Jesus*.

About A. D. 1120. Zonaras Annal. Præf.

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ σωτέ-
ρηται, ὅσα περὶ τῷ Σωτῆρι Ⓞ
ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ σωθεῖσθαι
τοῖς καὶ τῷ βαπτιστῇ Ἰωάννῃ [Ἰω-
σήφ Ⓞ.]

There also you have an
Abridgment of all that *Jose-
phus* wrote concerning our
Saviour *Jesus Christ*, and
John the Baptist.

Annal. I. p. 193.

Ταῦτα περὶ τούτου [Ἰωάν-
νου] καὶ λέξιν ὁ Ἰωσήφ Ⓞ
ἔγραψε· κτείνει τὸν Ἡρώ-
δης, ἀγαθὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὸς
Ἰουδαίους καλεῖσθαι ἀρετῶν
ἐπασκῆναι, καὶ τῇ πρὸς αἰ-
λήλους δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τῇ πρὸς
Θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ χρωμένους, βαπ-
τισμῷ συνιέναι [f. συνεῖναι.]
ἵνα ᾧ καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα αὐτῶν
φανείετο ὑποδεκτὴν. Δείσας
ὅτι Ἡρώδης τὸ ἐπὶ τοσούτον
πιθανὸν αὐτῷ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις,
μὴ ἐπὶ εἰσέσει φέροι τι, καὶ
πάντα ᾧ ἐώκασιν συμβεβη-
κὴ τῇ ἐκείνους πρὸς ἐξουσίαν· πολλὸν
κρείττον ἡγήσεται πρὸς τι νεώτε-
ρον ἐξ αὐτῶν γυνέετο, προλα-
βὼν ἀνελεῖν, τὸ μὴ ἐκδοῦν
ἡγομένης μὴ εἰς πρὸς γαμῶνα
ἐμπεσῶν.

Josephus wrote thus con-
cerning this [*John*] *verba-
tim*, that *Herod* slew him,
who was a good Man, and
commanded the *Jews* to ex-
ercise Virtue, both as to
Righteousness towards one
another, and Piety towards
God; and so to come to
Baptism: For that by this
Means, the washing [with
Water] would be accepta-
ble to him. Now *Herod*,
who feared lest the great
Influence *John* had over the
People, might put it into
his Power and Inclination
to raise a Rebellion, (for they
seemed ready to do any thing
he should advise,) thought
it best, by putting him to
Death, to prevent any Mis-
chief

απεισὼν μελανοεῖν. καὶ ὁ μὲν
 Ἰησοῦς τῷ Ἡρώδῃ δέσμιος
 Μαχαιρένῃα πεμφθεὶς,
 αὐτῇ κτίνουσι. Τοῖς δὲ Ἰε-
 ραῖοις δόξαν ὅτι τιμωρία τῇ
 αἰνῇ καὶ ὀλεθρον ἔσχετο
 Ἡρώδῃ. τῷ Θεῷ κακῶσαι Ἡ-
 ροδῶν θάλον.

chief he might cause, and
 not to bring himself into
 Difficulties by sparing a
 Man who might make him
 repent of it, when it should
 be too late. Accordingly he
 was sent a Prisoner, out of
 Herod's suspicious Temper,
 to *Machærus*, and was there
 put to Death. Now the

Jews had an Opinion that the Destruction of the Army
 was sent as a Punishment upon him, and a Mark of
 God's Displeasure to *Herod*.

Annal. Tom. I. p. 267.

Κατὰ τῆτον καὶ καὶ
 Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸς Ἰη-
 σοῦς Χριστός, ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐφά-
 νηται περὶ τὰ ταῦτα· ὅτι λέξιν
 ἔχουσιν ὁ Ἰωσήφ, ἐν τῷ ἱε-
 ραίῳ τῇ Ἀρχαλογίᾳ. Γίνε-
 ται δὲ καὶ τῆτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰη-
 σοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἀν-
 ὄμα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρη. ἦν
 δὲ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιη-
 τὴς, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων,
 ὃς σὺν ἡδονῇ τὰ ληθῆ δε-
 μιόμην. καὶ πολλὰς μὲν Ἰου-
 δαίους, πολλὰς δὲ τῷ Ἑλλη-
 νισμῷ ἐπηγάγει. ὁ Χριστὸς δὲ
 ἦν. καὶ αὐτὸν, ἐνδείξει τῷ
 πρώτῳ ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῶν,
 ὡς δὲ ὁπτιμηνότος Πι-
 λᾶτος, ἐκ ἐπαύσαντο ὅς τὸ
 αὐτὸν αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες· ἐ-
 κὴν δὲ αὐτοῖς τρίτῃ ἔχων
 ἔβαν πάλιν ζῶν, τῷ Θεῷ
 ὁφειλὼν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα
 μυσία

About this Time did also
 our Lord and God *Jesus*
Christ appear in *Judea*: con-
 cerning whom *Josephus*, in
 the 18th Book of *Antiqui-*
ties, says thus, *verbatim*:
 Now there was about this
 Time *Jesus*, a wise Man, if
 it be lawful to call him a
 Man: For he was a Doer
 of wonderful Works, a
 Teacher of such Men as re-
 ceive the Truth with Plea-
 sure. He drew over to him
 many of the *Jews*, and ma-
 ny of the *Gentiles*. He was
 the *Christ*. And when *Pi-*
late, at the Suggestion of
 the principal Men among us,
 had condemned him to the
 Cross, those that had loved
 him at first did not forsake
 him: For he appeared to
 them the third Day a-
 live again: As the Divine
 Prophets had said these, and
 a vast

μυρία περὶ αὐτῆς θαυμασία
εἰρηκότων. εἰς ἔτι τε νῦν τῶν
Χριστιανῶν ὅσοι τῷδε ὀνο-
μασμένων, οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φῦ-
λον. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ἀρχαι-
ολογῶν ὁ Ἰώσηπος ἐγγραφῇ
περὶ Χρῆστ.

a vast Number of other won-
derful Things concerning
him. And the Tribe of
Christians, so named from
him, are not extinct at this
Day. These Things *Jose-
phus* wrote in his Antiqui-
ties, concerning *Christ*.

About A. D. 1120. Glycas Annal. Part III. p. 234.

Τότε ὃ οὐ τε Φίλων ὁ σο-
φὸς καὶ Ἰώσηπος ἤμαζον.
Οὗτος φιλαλήθης, ἐλέγετο.
Ὅτι γὰρ τὸ τὴν βαπτιστὴν ἡ
Κυρίῳ ἐπαινεῖν, καὶ ὅτι τὸ
τὴν Χριστὸν ὁμοίως ἄνδρα σο-
φὸν μαρτυρεῖν, καὶ μεγάλων
σημείων ἐργάτῳ, σωρωθέν-
τα ὃ ζῶντα φανῆναι μὲν τρί-
τῳ ἡμέρᾳ.

Then did *Philo*, that wise
Man, and *Josephus* flourish.
This last was stiled the *Lo-
ver of Truth*, because he
commended *John* who bap-
tized our Lord; and because
he bore Witness that *Christ*,
in like Manner, was a wise
Man, and the Doer of great
Miracles; and that when he
was crucified he appeared
the third Day.

About A. D. 1120. Joannes Sarisburiensis Polycrat.
L. II. C. 9. e Rufini Versione.

Unde *Josephus* : Fuit
autem iisdem temporibus
Jesus, sapiens vir, si ta-
men virum eum appellare
fas est. Erat enim mira-
bilium operum effector, do-
ctorque hominum eorum
qui libenter quæ vera sunt
audiunt. Et multos qui-
dem *Judeorum*, multos e-
tiam ex *Gentibus* sibi ad-
junxit. *Christus* hic erat.
Hunc,

Thence it is that *Jose-
phus* says, Now there was at
that time *Jesus*, a wise Man,
if at least it may be lawful
to call him a Man : For he
was a Doer of wonderful
Works, a Teacher of such
Men as willingly hear the
Truth. He also drew over
to him many of the *Jews*,
and many of the *Gentiles*.
He was *Christ*. When *Pi-
late*, at the Accusation of
the

Hunc, accusatione primorum nostræ gentis virorum, cum Pilatus in crucem agendum esse decrevisset, non deseruerunt eum hi qui ab initio eum dilexerant. Apparuit autem die eis tertiâ, iterum vivus: Secundum quod divinitus inspirati prophetæ vel hæc vel alia de eo innumera miracula futura esse prædixerant. Sed & in bodierum diem Christianorum, qui ab eo nuncupati sint, & nomen perseverat & genus.

the principal Men of our Nation, had decreed that he should be crucified; those that had loved him from the Beginning did not forsake him: For he appeared to them the third Day alive again: According to what the divinely inspired Prophets had foretold, that these and innumerable other Miracles should come to pass about him. Moreover both the Name, and the Sect of *Christians*, who were named from him, continue in being to this Day.

About A. D. 1170. Petrus Comestor Hist. Evang. C. XXIX. e Rufini Versf.

Fuit autem iisdem temporibus Jesus, sapiens vir, si tamen virum eum nominare fas est. Erat enim mirabilium operum effector, & doctor hominum eorum qui libenter quæ vera sunt audiunt. Et multos quidem Judæorum, multos etiam ex Gentilibus sibi adjunxit. Christus hic erat. Hunc, accusatione primorum nostræ gentis virorum, cum Pilatus in crucem agendum esse decrevisset, non dese-

There was at this Time *Jesus*, a wise Man, if at least it be lawful to call him a Man; for he was a Doer of wonderful Works, a Teacher of such Men as willingly hear the Truth. He also drew over to him many of the *Jews*, and many of the *Gentiles*. He was *Christ*. And when *Pilate*, at the Accusation of the principal Men of our Nation, had decreed that he should be crucified, those who had loved him from the Beginning did not forsake him, for he appeared

deseruerunt hi qui ab initio dilexerant. Apparuit enim his iterum vivus, secundum quod divinitus inspirati prophetæ vel hæc vel alia de eo innumera miracula futura esse prædixerant. Sed & in hodiernum diem Christianorum, qui ab ipso nuncupati sunt, & nomen perseverat & genus.

to them alive again, according to what the divinely inspired Prophets had foretold, that these and innumerable other Miracles should come to pass about him. Moreover both the Name and the Sect of *Christians*, who were named from him, continue in being unto this Day.

About A. D. 1170. Gotfridus Viterbiensis Chron. p. 366. e Vers. Rufini.

Bellum maximum inter Aretam Regem Arabum & Herodem accidisse refert Josephus, propter peccatum quod in Joannem Herodes perpetraverat. De Christo etiam idem Josephus sic scribit: Fuit his temporibus Jesus, sapiens vir, si tamen virum nominari fas est. Erat enim mirabilium operum effector, doctorque hominum eorum qui libenter quæ vera sunt, audiunt. Et multos quidem Judæorum, multos etiam ex Gentilibus sibi adjunxit. Christus hic erat. Hunc, accusatione primorum nostræ gentis virorum, cum Pilatus in crucem agendum

Josephus relates, that a very great War arose between Aretas King of the Arabians and Herod; on Account of the Sin which Herod had committed against John. Moreover the same Josephus writes thus concerning Christ: There was at this Time Jesus, a wise Man, if, at least, it be lawful to call him a Man: For he was a Doer of wonderful Works, a Teacher of such Men as willingly hear the Truth. He also drew over to him many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was Christ. And when Pilate, at the Accusation of the principal Men of our Nation, had decreed that he should be crucified, those that had loved him from the Beginning

undum esse decrevisset, non deseruerunt hi qui ab initio eum dilexerant. Apparuit enim eis tertio die iterum vivus, secundum quod divinitus inspirati prophetæ vel hæc vel alia de eo innumera miracula futura esse prædixerant. Sed & in hodiernum diem Christianorum, qui ab ipso nuncupati sunt, & nomen perseverat & genus.

Beginning did not forsake him: For he appeared to them the third Day alive again, according to what the divinely inspired Prophets had foretold, that these and innumerable other Miracles should come to pass about him. Moreover both the Name and Sect of *Christians*, who were named from him, continue in being unto this Day.

About A. C. 1240. Vincentius Bellovacensis e
Vers. Rufini.

Fuit his temporibus Jesus, sapiens vir, si eum virum nominare fas est; erat enim mirabilium operum patrator, & doctor eorum qui audiunt libenter quæ vera sunt, multosque sibi Judæorum, & multos adjunxit ex Gentilibus. Christus hic erat. Hunc, accusatione primorum nostræ gentis, cum Pilatus in crucem agendum decrevisset, non deseruerunt eum hi qui ab initio dilexerant. Apparuit enim eis iterum tertid die vivus: Secundum quod inspirati prophetæ vel hæc vel alia de eo innumera miracula de ipso futura prædixerant. Sed & usque in hodiernum diem Christi-

There was at this Time Jesus, a wise Man, if it be lawful to call him a Man: For he was a Doer of wonderful Works, and a Teacher of those that willingly hear the Truth. He also drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was *Christ*. And when *Pilate*, at the Accusation of the principal Men of our Nation, had decreed that he should be crucified, those who had loved him from the Beginning did not forsake him: For he appeared to them the third Day alive again: According to what the divinely inspired Prophets had foretold, that these and innumerable other Miracles should come to pass about him. Moreover both the Name,

*Christianorum, qui ab eo
dicti sunt, perseverat &
nomen & genus.*

Name, and the Sect of *Chri-
stians*, who were named from
him, continue in being unto
this Day

About A. D. 1030. Nicephorus Callistus Hist.
Eccl. I. 20. p. 90, 91.

Ταῦτα ᾗ [de Herode
Tetrarcha] ἔ μόνον ἡ τῶν
ιερωῶν εὐαγγελίων βίβλῳ, ἀλ-
λά καὶ ὁ φιλαλήθης Ἰωσήφῳ
μαρτυρεῖ, τῆς τε Ηρωδιάδῳ
μνημῶν ποιῶν, ὡς Ηρώ-
δης ζῶντι μὴ τὰ δελφῶ δια-
σχίσσειε καὶ γυναικὰ ἐκείνην, καὶ
οἰκειώσασθαι· ἀθετήσκει ᾗ τῶν
προτέρων ἐκ νόμων γεγενημέ-
νῳ αὐτῷ, Αρέτα ὁ Πετραίων
βασιλέως θυγατέρα, καὶ κεί-
νῳ πρὸς γάμον ἀγαγέσθαι
καὶ σπουκίαν· δι' ἣν καὶ τῷ Ἰω-
άννῳ ἀνελὼν, πόλεμον πρὸς
Αρέταν ἤρχετο, ὡς ἂν ἡ τιμω-
ρῆς τέτω τῷ θυγατρὸς· ἐν
ᾧ πολέμῳ πάντῃ τῷ Ηρώδῃ
ἀσφαλεῖναι στρατὸν ἰσορεῖ.
παθεῖν ᾗ ταῦτα Ἀφ' ᾗ καὶ ὁ
Ἰωάννης καθ' ὅλον τὸν αἰῶνα
δικαιοῦται ᾗ τῷ Ἰω-
άννῳ προσμαρτυρεῖ, καὶ τῷ
βαπτίσματι μέμνηται τῷ εὐ-
αγγελίῳ καὶ πᾶν ἐν τοῖς περὶ
αὐτοῦ συμφωνῶν. ἰσορεῖ ᾗ Ἀφ'
καὶ Ηρωδιάδα καὶ τῷ βασιλείᾳ
καὶ Ηρώδῳ συνεπιπλῶναι,
μεθ' ἧς καὶ εἰς ὑπερολίαν κα-
τακτεθῆναι. Βιάννα ᾗ ἦν
αὐτῷ φάλαγγος, ὁμο-
ρῶν

Now this [concerning *He-
rod the Tetrarch*] is attested
to, not only by the Book of
the Holy Gospels, but by
Josephus, that Lover of
Truth, who also makes men-
tion of *Herodias* his Bro-
ther's Wife, whom *Herod*
had taken away from him,
while he was alive, and
married her, having divorced
his former lawful Wife;
who was the Daughter of
Aretas, King of the *Petraean
Arabians*. This *Herodias* he
had married, and lived with
her. On whose Account al-
so, when he had slain *John*,
he made War with *Aretas*,
because his Daughter had
been dishonourably used. In
which War he relates, that
all *Herod's* Army was de-
stroyed; and that he suffer-
ed this on Account of the
most unjust Slaughter of *John*.
He also adds, that *John* was
a most righteous Man.
Moreover he makes mention
of his Baptism: Agreeing
in all Points thereto relating
with the Gospel. He also
informs us, that *Herod* lost
his Kingdom on Account of
Herodias; with whom also
he

Ἡ αὕτη πόλις τῆ Γαλλίων,
 πρὸς τὸ βάθῳ τῆ ἐπαύρας
 κειμένη. Ἐν μέντοι τῷ τῆ Αρ-
 χαιολογίας ὀκτωκαδεκάτῳ,
 αὐταῖς πρὸς λέξεσι καὶ τὰδε πε-
 ρὶ Ἰωάννης Φησί· Τισὶ δὲ τῶ
 Ἰουδαίων ἐδόκει ὀλωλέναι τῶ
 Ἡρώδῃ στρατὸν ὑπὸ τῷ Θεῷ,
 καὶ μάλα δικαίως τιννυμένης,
 καὶ ποιῶν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ ὁπι-
 καλυμένης βαπτιστῇ· κλείνει γὰρ
 τῷτον Ἡρώδης, ἀγαθὸν ἀν-
 δρα, καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις κελού-
 οντα ἀρετῇ ἐπασκεῖν καὶ τῇ
 πρὸς ἀλλήλους δικαιοσύνῃ,
 καὶ πρὸς τὸ Θεὸν εὐσεβεῖα χρω-
 μένοις, βαπτισμῷ σιωπῇ.
 ἔτω γὰρ καὶ τῶ βαπτιστῇ ἄπο-
 δεκτὴν αὐτῷ φανείδῃ, μὴ
 ὅτι τινων ἀμαρτάνων παραι-
 τήσει χρωμένων, ἀλλ' ἐφ'
 ἀγνείᾳ τῷ σώματι, αἵτε δὴ
 καὶ τῷ ψυχῇ δικαιοσύνῃ προ-
 εκκαθαρευόμενης. Καὶ τῶ ἀλ-
 λων συσσεφομένων, καὶ γὰρ ἤρ-
 θησαν ὅτι πλεῖστον τῇ ἀκρο-
 ασίᾳ τῶ λόγων, δέσας Ἡρώ-
 δης τὸ ὅτι ποσὸνδε πιθανὸν
 αὐτῷ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, μὴ ἐπ'
 ἄποστασίᾳ τινὶ φέροι, πάντῃ
 γὰρ ἐώκεσαν συμβεβηλὴ τῇ ἐκεί-
 νῃ πρὸς ὁρῶντες, πολὺ κρείττον
 ἢ γένοιτο πρὶν τι νεώτερον ὑπ'
 αὐτῷ γινέσθαι προλαβὼν ἀναι-
 ρεῖν, ἢ μελαβολῆς γηρομῆνης
 εἰς πρὸς γὰρ ἐμπεσὼν μελα-
 νοεῖν. καὶ ὁ μὲν ὑποψία τῇ
 Ἡρώδῃ δέσμιον εἰς τὸ Μα-
 χαβεῖντα πεμφθεὶς, τὸ φερέ-
 ελον

he was condemned to be ba-
 nished to *Vienna* : Which
 was their Place of Exile ;
 and a City bordering upon
Gaul, and lying near the
 utmost Bounds of the *West*.
 However, in the 18th Book
 of Antiquities, he says this
 farther concerning *John*, ver-
 batim : Some of the *Jews*
 thought that the Destruction
 of *Herod's* Army came from
 God, and that very justly ;
 as a Punishment for what he
 did against *John*, that was
 called the *Baptist*. For *He-*
rod slew him, who was a
 good Man, and one that
 commanded the *Jews* to ex-
 ercise Virtue, both as to
 Righteousness towards one
 another, and Piety towards
 God ; and so to come to
 Baptism : For that by this
 Means the washing [with
 Water] would appear ac-
 ceptable to him, when they
 made use of it not for the
 putting away [or Remission]
 of some Sins [only ;] but for
 the Purification of the Bo-
 dy : Supposing still that the
 Soul be thoroughly purified
 beforehand by Righteousness.
 Now when [many] others
 came in Crouds about him,
 for they were greatly moved
 by hearing his Words, *He-*
rod was afraid that his so
 great Power of Persuasion
 might tend to some Sedi-
 tion or other : For they
 seemed disposed to do every
 thing

ειον, ταύτη κτίνου. Ταῦτα
 ἡ δ' ἰώσηπτος.

thing he should advise them to. He supposed it better to prevent any Attempt for Innovation from him, by cutting him off; than after any such Mutation should be brought about, and the Publick suffer, to repent [of that Negligence.] Accordingly he was sent a Prisoner, out of *Herod's* suspicious Temper, to the Castle of *Macherus*, and there slain. This is also *Josephus's* Account.

I. 39. p. 124. Ακόλυσ-
 θον δ' οἶμαι ἡ τ' φιλαλήθη
 παρ' Εβραίοις ἰσραηλὸν ἰώση-
 πον εἰς μέσον προθέμενον, δια-
 πλεῖ δ' Σωτῆρς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς
 Χριστὸς διέξεισιν, ἐν τῷ ἡ' τ'
 Αρχαιολογίας, ὡσπερ τινα
 πορυνίδα τῇ πρώτῃ μοι τ' ἰσο-
 ρεμῶν ὑπιδεῖναι. πλεῖ γὰρ τῷ
 προσδρόμῳ Ἰωάννῃ διεξεληθὼν,
 ὅσα μικρὸν ἄνωθεν διελάβο-
 μιν, εἶτα ἡ περὶ τῷ Χριστῷ
 αὐταῖς λέξεσιν ἔγω φησί·
 Γίνετο δ' ἡ τ' τῷ Ἰησοῦς, ἀνὴρ
 σοφός, εἶγε ἄνδρες λέγειν ἀν-
 τὸν χρεὶ ἦν γὰρ παροδοξῶν
 ἔργων ποιητής, διδάσκαλος
 ἀνθρώπων τ' ἡδὸν ἡ τ' ἀληθῆ δε-
 χομένων. ἡ πολλὰς μὲν τ'
 Ἰουδαίων, πολλὰς δ' ἡ τ' ἀπὸ
 τῷ Ἑλληνικῷ ἐπηγάγετο. ὁ Χρι-
 στὸς ἔτι ἦν. ἡ αὐτὸν, ἐνδείξει
 τ' πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡ-
 μῖν, σαυρῶν ὑπιδεῖναι.
 Πιλάτου, ἐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ
 πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσαντες·
 ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτῃ ἔχων
 ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τ' θείων
 προφητῶν ταῦτα ἡ ἀλλὰ
 περὶ αὐτῷ θαυμάσια εἰρη-
 κῶν, εἰσέτι τε νῦν τ' Χρι-
 στιανῶν

I think it is fit here to produce the *Hebrew* Historian *Josephus*, that Lover of Truth; and to add, by way of Conclusion, to this my first Book of History, what he discourses concerning our Saviour *Jesus Christ*, in the 18th Book of Antiquities. For when he had discoursed concerning *John*, the Fore-runner [of *Christ*] what I have set down a little above, he afterwards says thus of *Christ*, *verbatim*. Now there was about this Time *Jesus*, a wise Man, if it be lawful to call him a Man: For he was a Doer of wonderful Works, a Teacher of such Men as receive the Truth with Pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the *Jews*, and many of the *Gentiles*. He was the *Christ*. And when *Pilate*, at the Suggestion of the principal Men among us, had condemned him to the Cross, those that had loved him at first did not forsake him: For he appeared to them the third Day alive again: As the Divine Prophets had said these, and other

αιωνων, ὅτι τὰδε ὀνομασ-
μενων, οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ Φῶλον.

him, are not extinct at this Day.

other wonderful Things con-
cerning him. And the Tribe
of *Christians*, so named from

About A. D. 1450. Hardmannus Schedelius Chron.
p. 110.

*Josephus Judæus, dictus
Flavius, sacerdos; & Mat-
tathiae ejus gentis sacerdo-
tis filius, Historicus qui-
dem celeberrimus, multa-
rumque rerum peritissimus,
vir sane bonus, & egregi-
us, qui de Christo optime
sensit.*

*Josephus the Jew, who
was called Flavius, a Priest,
and the Son of Mattathias,
a Priest of that Nation, a
most celebrated Historian,
and very skilful in many
Things. He was certainly
a good Man, and of an ex-
cellent Character: Who
had the highest Opinion of
Christ.*

About A. D. 1480. Platina de Vitis Pontificum in
Christo.

*Quid Christus egerit in
adolescencia, usque ad tri-
gesimum annum, quo a Jo-
hanne Zachariae filio aqua
baptizatus est, dicere prae-
termittam: cum non solum
Evangelia & Epistolae re-
bus a se optime ac sanctis-
sime gestis plenae sunt; ve-
rum etiam eorum libri qui
de ejus vita, moribus & in-
stitutis abhorruere. Flavi-
us ille Josephus, qui lin-
gua Graeca Antiquitatem
Judaicam viginti libris con-
scripsit, cum ad Tiberii
principis imperium venisset,
Fuit, inquit, eisdem tem-
poribus*

I shall avoid mentioning
what *Christ* did until the
30th Year of his Age, when
he was baptized by *John*,
the Son of *Zacharias*; be-
cause not only the Gospels
and Epistles are full of those
Acts of his, which he did
in the most excellent and
most holy Manner, but the
Books of such as were quite
remote from his way of liv-
ing and acting, and ordain-
ing, are also full of the
same. *Flavius Josephus* him-
self, who wrote twenty Books
of *Jewish Antiquities*, in the
Greek Tongue, when he
had proceeded as far as the
Government of the Empe-
ror

poribus *Iesus*, vir quidam sapiens, si tamen virum eum nominare fas est. Erat enim mirabilium operum effector, ac hominum doctor, eorum maxime qui quæ vera sunt libenter audiunt. Hanc ob rem multos tum ex *Judæis* tum ex *Gentilibus* sibi adjunxit. *Christus* hic erat. Hunc autem cum *Pilatus*, a principibus nostræ gentis instigatus, in crucem agendum censuisset, non tamen hi deseruere qui eum ab initio dilexerant. Eisdem præterea die tertio post mortem vivus apparuit: quemadmodum divinitus inspirati prophetae & hæc & alia innumerable miracula futura esse prædixere. Perseverat & usque in hodiernum diem celebre *Christianorum* nomen, ab ipso sumptum; perseverat & genus.

Idem quoque *Iosephus* *Iohannem Baptistam* verum Prophetam, & ob eam rem ab omnibus in pretio habitum jussu *Herodis magni Herodis filii*, paulo ante mortem *Christi* cæsum fuisse affirmat, in castello *Machærunte*. Non quod sibi & regno timeret, ut idem ait; sed quod *Herodiadem*, *Agrippæ* sororem,

ac

ror Tiberius, says; there was in those Days *Iesus*, a certain wise Man, if at least it be lawful to call him a Man; For he was a Doer of wonderful Works, and a Teacher of Men, of such especially as willingly hear the Truth. On this Account he drew over to him many both of the *Jews* and *Gentiles*. He was *Christ*. But when *Pilate*, instigated by the principal Men of our Nation, had decreed that he should be crucified, yet did not those that had loved him from the Beginning forsake him. And besides, he appeared to them the third Day after his Death alive, as the divinely inspired Prophets had foretold that these and innumerable other Miracles should come to pass about him. And the famous Name of *Christians*, taken from him, as well as their Sect, do still continue in being.

The same *Iosephus* also affirms, that *John the Baptist*, a true Prophet, and on that Account one that was had in Esteem by all Men, was slain by *Herod*, the Son of *Herod the Great*, a little before the Death of *Christ*, in the Castle *Machærus*. Not because he was afraid for himself, and his Kingdom, as the same Author says; but because he had incestuously

de Philippi fratris, viri optimi, uxorem incestis nuptiis sibi conjunxerat. ously married *Herodias*, the Sister of *Agrippa*, and the Wife of that excellent Person, his Brother *Philip*.

About A. D. 1480. *Trithemius Abbas de Scriptor. Ecclesiast.*

Josephus Judæus, etsi Judæus permanserit, genus tamen Christianorum sæpe laudavit. Et de Domino nostro Jesu Christo in 18 Antiquitatum libro insigne testimonium descripsit. *Josephus the Jew*, altho' he continued to be a *Jew*, did frequently commend the *Christians*; and in the 18th Book of *Antiquities* wrote down an eminent Testimony concerning our Lord *Jesus Christ*.

N. B. Whether *Trithemius* found more Passages concerning the *Christians* in his Copies of *Josephus's* genuine Works now or formerly extant; or ascribed the Book concerning the *Universe* to him, and therein met with other Commendations of the *Christians*, than were in his genuine Works, can not now be determined. So far is plain, that this very learned Abbot, who affirms that *Josephus* frequently commended the *Christians*, had more Testimonies in the Works he believed to be *Josephus's*, to this Purpose, than we are at present acquainted with. Which seems to have been the Case of *Origen*, *Eusebius*, the Author of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, *Suidas*, and *Theophylact* also, as has appeared in our Quotations out of them.

N. B. To prevent Tedioufness, I omit to transcribe the Attestations to the *Latin Version* from *Haimo*, *Anonymus Bambergensis* MS. *Cunradus Urspergensis*, *Albertus Stadenfis*, &c. mentioned by *Fabricius*, p. 61. all which Authors cite the same Testimony concerning *Christ* also, as then extant in their Copies.

OBSERVATIONS

From the foregoing

Evidence and Citations.

I. **T**HE *Style* of all these original Testimonies belonging to *Josephus*, is exactly the *Style* of the same *Josephus*, and especially his *Style* about those Parts of his Antiquities wherein we find these Testimonies. This is denied by no body as to the other concerning *John the Baptist*, and *James the Just*; and is now become equally undeniable as to that concerning *Christ*, by the successful Labours of the Learned Mr. *Daubuz*, in his *Parallels* already set down at large. Nor has there often been the like Example of Imposition on Mankind, and even on the Learned themselves, as *Tanaquil Faber* here put upon them; in rashly and without any Proof pretending, that this Testimony was not the *Style* nor Composition of *Josephus*; but was rather the Forgery of *Eusebius*. Nor has there often been a more certain Confutation given of the Falshood of any such Assertion, than Mr. *Daubuz* has offered us on this important Occasion. I wish our great Pretenders to critical Sagacity may learn Wisdom by this Example, and take Care to make no more *Affirmations* of this Nature, without being prepared to prove them by better Evidence than he proved his, I mean their own *Suspensions* or *Supposals* only.

II. The

II. The Clauses in *Josephus* concerning *John the Baptist*, and *James the Just*; especially those in all our present Copies, as well as they are cited from their Copies by the Ancients, are plainly and undeniably genuine. For I find that those who are very uneasy at the Supposal of the Genuineness of the principal Testimony concerning *Christ* himself; and by Consequence cannot be very easy in the Supposal that these others are genuine, do yet generally allow them to be genuine. So far as I observe, *Blondel* is the principal Author who has a Mind to set aside one of them, that concerning *John the Baptist*, though expressly quoted by *Origen* himself, out of *Josephus*; but since he hardly produces any thing like an Argument for setting it aside, I shall take no farther Notice of it. Nor indeed have they any Handle from the Silence either of *Origen*, who mentions both; or of *Photius*, who mentions the former Testimony: Which supposed Silence of theirs is yet the principal Allegation against the other.

III. These Testimonies therefore being confessedly and undeniably written by *Josephus* himself, it is next to impossible that he should wholly omit some Testimony concerning *Jesus Christ*: Nay, while his Testimonies of *John the Baptist* and of *James the Just* are so honourable, and give them so great Characters, it is next to impossible that his Testimony concerning *Christ* should be other than very honourable, or such as afforded him a still greater Character also. Could the very same Author, who gave such a full and advantageous Character of *John the Baptist*, the Forerunner of *Jesus of Nazareth*; all whose Disciples were by him directed to *Jesus of Nazareth*, as to the true *Messias*; and all whose Disciples became afterwards the Disciples of *Jesus of Nazareth*, say nothing, or say nothing honourable of that *Jesus of Nazareth* himself? And this in an History of those very Times in which
he

he was born, and lived and died? And that while the Writer lived but a little after him in the same Countrey in which he was born and lived and died? This is almost incredible. And further, could the very same Author, who gave such an advantageous Character of *James the Just*, and this under the very Appellation of *James, the Brother of Jesus who was called Christ*, which *James* was one of the principal Disciples or Apostles of this *Jesus Christ*, and had been many Years the only *Christian* Bishop of the believing *Jews* of *Judæa* and *Jerusalem*, in the very Days, and in the very Country of this Writer; Could he, I say, wholly omit any, nay a very honourable Account of *Jesus Christ* himself, whose Disciple, Apostle, and Bishop this *James* most certainly was? This is also almost incredible. Hear what * *Ittigius*, one of the wisest and learnedst of all those who have lately inclined to give up the Testimony concerning *Christ*, as it stands in our Copies, for spurious, says upon this Occasion. “ If, says *Ittigius*, any one object to me, “ that *Josephus* has not omitted *John the Baptist*, “ the Forerunner of *Christ*, nor *James* the Disci- “ ple of *Christ*; and that therefore he could not have “ done the Part of a good Historian if he had been “ intirely silent concerning *Christ*, I shall freely “ grant, that *Josephus* was not intirely silent con- “ cerning *Christ*: Nay, I shall farther grant, that “ when *Josephus* was speaking of *Christ*, he did not “ abstain from his Commendation. For we are “ not to determine from that inveterate Hatred “ which the modern *Jews* bear to *Christ*, what was “ the Behaviour of those *Jews*, upon whom the “ Miracles that were daily wrought by the Apo- “ stles in the Name of *Christ* imprinted a sacred “ Horror.

IV. The famous Clause in this Testimony of *Jo-*

* Prolegom. in *Joseph.*

Josephus concerning *Christ*, ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, *This was Christ, or the Christ*, did not mean that this *Jesus* was the *Christ* of *God*, or the true *Messias* of the *Jews*; but that this *Jesus* was distinguished from all others of that Name, of which there were not a few, as mentioned by *Josephus* himself, by the Addition of the other Name of *Christ*: Or that this Person was no other than he whom all the World knew by the Name of *Jesus Christ*; and his Followers by the Name of *Christians*. This I esteem to be a clear Case, and that from the Arguments following.

(1) The *Greeks* and *Romans*, for whose use *Josephus* wrote his Antiquities, could no otherwise understand these Words. The *Jews* indeed, and afterward the *Christians*, who knew that a great *Messias*, a Person that was to be *Christ*, the Anointed of *God*; that was to perform the Office of a *King*, a *Priest*, and a *Prophet* to *God's* People, might readily so understand this Expression: But *Josephus*, as I have already noted, wrote here, not to *Jews* or *Christians*, but to *Greeks* and *Romans*, who knew nothing of this; but knew very well that an eminent Person living in *Judæa*, whose Name was *Jesús Chrest*, or *Jesus Christ*, had founded a new and numerous Sect, which took the latter of those Names, and were every where from him called *Chrestians* or *Christians*^b: In which Sense alone could they understand these Words of *Josephus*; and in which Sense alone, I believe, he desired they should understand them. Nor does *Josephus* ever use the *Hebrew* Term *Messiah* in any of his Writings; nor the *Greek* Term *Christ* in any such Acceptation elsewhere.

(2) *Josephus* himself as good as explains his own meaning, and that by the last Clause of this very

^b See *Authen. Rec.* Vol. II. p. 1113.

Passage, where he says the *Christians* were named from this *Christ*; without a Syllable as though he really meant he was the *true Messiah*, or *Christ of God*. He farther seems to me to explain this his meaning in those two other Places, where alone he elsewhere mentions this Name of *Christ*; that is when, upon two several Occasions of the mention of *James*, both when he was condemned by *Ananus*, and when he was slain by the *Jews*, he calls him the *Brother of Jesus*, not that was the *true Messiah*, or the *true Christ*, but only *that was called Christ*.

(3) It was quite beside the Purpose of *Josephus* to declare himself here to be a *Christian*, or a Believer in *Jesus* as the *true Messiah*. Had he intended so to do, he would surely have explained the meaning of the Word *Christ* to his *Greek* and *Roman* Readers: He would surely have been a great Deal fuller and larger in his Accounts of *Christ*, and of the *Christian* Religion. Nor would such a Declaration at that Time have recommended him, or his Nation, or his Writings, to either the *Greeks* or the *Romans*: Of his Reputation with both which People he is known to have been, in the Writing of these Antiquities, very greatly solicitous.

(4) *Josephus's* usual Way of Writing is Historical and Declarative of Facts, and of the Opinions of others; and but rarely such as directly informs us of his own Opinion; unless we prudently gather it from what he says historically, or as the Opinions of others. This is very observable in the Writings of *Josephus*; and in particular as to what he says of *John the Baptist*, and of *James the Just*. So that this Interpretation is most probable, as most agreeable to *Josephus's* Way of Writing in parallel Cases.

(5) This seems to be the universal Sense of all the Ancients, without Exception, who cite this
Testi-

Testimony from him: And though they almost every where own this to be the true Reading, yet do they every where suppose *Josepbus* to be still an unbelieving Jew, and not a believing Christian. Nay *Jerom* appears so well assured of this Interpretation, and that *Josepbus* did not mean to declare any more by these Words than a common Opinion, that, according to his usual Way of interpreting Authors, not to the Words but to the Sense, (of which we have, I think, two more Instances in his Accounts out of *Josepbus*, now before us) he renders this Clause *credebatur esse Christus*; He was believed to be Christ: And this while we learn from his own intimate Friend *Sophronius's* Greek Version of his Latin Version, that *Jerom* had the common Greek Reading here, *ὁ Χριστὸς ἔστιν ἡν*, This was Christ. Nor is the parallel Expression of *Pilate* to be otherwise understood, when he made that Inscription upon the Cross, *This is Jesus the King of the Jews*: which is well explained by himself elsewhere, and corresponds to the Import of the present Clause, *What shall I do with Jesus who is called Christ* ^d? And we may full as well prove from *Pilate's* Inscription upon the Cross, that he thereby declared himself a Believer in Christ, for the real King of the Jews, as we can from these Words of *Josepbus*, that he thereby declared himself to be a real Believer in him, as the true Messiah.

V. Though *Josepbus* did not design here to declare himself openly to be a Christian, yet could he not possibly believe all that he here asserts concerning *Jesus Christ*, unless he were so far a Christian as the Jewish Nazarens or Ebionites then were; who believed *Jesus of Nazareth* to be the true Messiah, without believing he was more than a Man: Who also believed the Necessity of the Observation of the ceremonial Law of *Moses* in order

^d Matth. xxvii. 31.

^d y 17, 22.

to Salvation for all Mankind: Which were the two main Articles of those *Jewish Christians* Faith, tho' in Opposition to all the thirteen Apostles of *Jesus Christ*, in the first Century; and in Opposition to the whole Catholick Church of *Christ* in the following Centuries also. Accordingly I have elsewhere proved, that *Josephus* was no other, in his own Mind and Conscience, than a *Nazarene* or *Ebionite Jewish Christian*; and have observed that this intire Testimony, and all that *Josephus* says of *John the Baptist*, and of *James*, as well as his absolute Silence about all the rest of the Apostles and their Companions, exactly agrees to him under that Character, and no other. And indeed to me it is most astonishing, that all our learned Men, who have of late considered these Testimonies of *Josephus*, except the converted Jew *Galatinus*^e, should miss such an obvious and natural Observation. We all know from this St. *James's* own Words, that *so many Myriads of Jews as believed in Christ*, in the first Century, *were all zealous of the ceremonial Law*; or were no other than *Nazarene* or *Ebionite Christians*: And, by Consequence, if there were any Reason to think our *Josephus* to be, in any Sense, a Believer or a *Christian*; as from all these Testimonies there were very great ones; all those and all other Reasons could not but conspire to assure us, he was no other than a *Nazarene* or *Ebionite Christian*. See *Authent. Records Vol. II. p. 954—960*. And this I take to be the plain and evident Key of this whole Matter.

VI. Since therefore *Josephus* appears to have been, in his own Heart and Conscience, no other than a *Nazarene* or *Ebionite Christian*, and, by Consequence, with them rejected all our ^e *Greek Gospels* and *Greek Books of the New Testament*; and received only the *Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarens*

^e De Arcanis Cathol. Verit. Cap. IV. apud Jos. Edit. ult. Vol. II. p. 275.

^f Act. XXI. 20.

^g Authent. Rec. Vol. II. p. 647—650.

or *Ebionites*, styled by them ^a *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*; or according to the twelve Apostles; or even according to *Matthew*; we ought always to have that *Nazarene* or *Ebionite Gospel*, with the other *Nazarene* or *Ebionite Fragments* in View, when we consider any Passages of *Josephus* relating to *Christ* or to *Christianity*. Thus, since that Gospel omitted all that is in the Beginning of our *St. Matthew's* and *St. Luke's Gospels*; and began with the Ministry of *John the Baptist*: In which first Parts of the Gospel History are the Accounts of the Slaughter of the Infants, and of the Enrolment or Taxation under *Augustus Cæsar* and *Herod*, 'tis no great Wonder that *Josephus* has not taken Care particularly and clearly to preserve those Histories to us. Thus when we find that *Josephus* calls *James*, the Brother of *Christ*, by the Name of *James the Just*, and describes him as a *most just or righteous Man*, in an especial Manner; we are to remember that such is his Name and Character in the Gospel according to the *Hebrews*, and the other *Ebionite Remains* of *Hegeſippus*; but no where else, that I remember, in the earliest Antiquity. Nor are we to suppose they herein referred to any other than that *Righteousness which was by the Jewish Law*, wherein *St. Paul* ^b, before he embraced *Christianity*, professed himself to have been blameless. Thus when *Josephus* with other *Jews*, ascribed the Miseries of that Nation under *Vespasian* and *Titus*, with the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, to the barbarous Murder of *James the Just*, we must remember, what we learn from the *Ebionite Fragments* of *Hegeſippus*, that these *Ebionites* interpreted a Prophecy of *Isaiab* as foretelling this very Murder, and those consequent Miseries: *Let us take away the Just One; for he is unprofitable to us: Therefore shall they eat the Fruit of their own Ways.* ⁱ

^a See Grabe Spicileg. Sec. I. p. 15—31. & Sec. II. p. 203.

&c. ^b Philip iii. 4, 5, 6.

ⁱ *Isaiab* iii. 10.

Thus when *Josephus* says, as we have seen, that the most equitable Citizens of *Jerusalem*, and those that were most zealous of the Law, were very uneasy at the Condemnation of this *James*, and some of his Friends ^k or Fellow *Christians*, by the High Priest and Sanhedrim about *A. D.* 62. and declares that he himself was one of those *Jews* who thought the terrible Miseries of that Nation, Effects of the Vengeance of God for their Murder of this *James*, about *A. D.* 68. we may easily see those Opinions could only be the Opinions of converted *Jews* or *Ebionites*. The High Priest and Sanhedrim, who always persecuted the *Christians* and now condemned these *Christians*; and the Body of those unbelieving *Jews* who are supposed to suffer for murdering this *James*, the Head of the *Nazarene* or *Ebionite Christians* in *Judaea*, could not, to be sure, be of that Opinion. Nor could *Josephus* himself be of the same Opinion, as he declares he was, without the strongest Inclinations to the *Christian Religion*; or without being secretly a *Christian Jew*, i. e. a *Nazarene* or *Ebionite*. Which thing is, by the way, a very great additional Argument that such he was, and no other. Thus lastly, when *Josephus* is cited in ^l *Suidas* as affirming that *Jesus* officiated with the Priests in the Temple; this Account is by no means disagreeable to the Pretensions of the *Ebionites*. *Hegesippus* the *Ebionite*, affirming the very same of *James* the Just also. Not that such *Ebionite* Testimonies are always authentick, or to be depended on; but that *Josephus*, an *Ebionite*, might be sometimes imposed upon by his Brethren, the *Ebionites*, in such Matters: As I have elsewhere shewn he was imposed upon by them in certain Accounts relating to the Conversion of *Abgarus*, ^m and his Queen *Helena* to

^k *Eraius* in *Syncellus*. See *Prim. Christ. Reviv'd*, Vol. III. p. 42—46. ^l *Suid.* in *1705*. ^m *Authent. Rec.* Vol. III. p. 954—959.

Christianity. To which Treatise the Reader must be here referred for farther Satisfaction.

VII. The first Author I have alledg'd for the famous Testimony concerning our Saviour in *Josephus*, is *Justin Martyr*; one so nearly coeval with *Josephus*, that he might be born about the Time when he wrote his *Antiquities*. *Justin* elsewhere^a appeals to the same *Antiquities* by that very Name: And though he does not here directly quote them, yet does he seem to me to allude to this very Testimony in them concerning our Saviour, when he affirms in this Place, to *Trypho the Jew*, that *His Nation originally knew that Jesus was risen from the Dead, and ascended into Heaven, as the Prophecies did foretel was to happen.* Since there neither now is, nor probably, in the Days of *Justin* was any other *Jewish* Testimony extant, which is so agreeable to what *Justin* here affirms of those *Jews*, as is this of *Josephus* the *Jew* before us. Nor, indeed, does he seem to me to have had any thing else particularly in his View here, but the 13th and 14th Clauses of this very Testimony; where *Josephus* says, that *Jesus appeared to his Followers alive the third Day after his Crucifixion; as the Divine Prophets had foretold these, and a vast Number of other wonderful Things concerning him.* I must leave this Application to the impartial Readers own Consideration.

VIII. The second Author I have quoted for *Josephus's* Testimonies of *John the Baptist*, of *Jesus of Nazareth*, and of *James the Just*, is *Origen*: Who is indeed allow'd on all Hands to have quoted him for the excellent Characters of *John the Baptist*, and of *James the Just*; but whose supposed intire Silence about this Testimony concerning *Christ* is usually alledged as the principal Argument against its being genuine: And particularly as to the Clause, *ὁ Χριστὸς ἔτι & νῦν, This was the Christ: And that, as*

^a Cohort. ad Græc. p. 10.

we have seen, because he twice assures us, that, in his Opinion, *Josephus did not himself acknowledge Jesus for Christ*. Now as to this latter Clause, I have already shewed, that *Josephus* did not here, in writing to *Greeks* and *Romans*, mean any such thing by those Words as *Jews* and *Christians* naturally understand by them: I have also observed, that all the Ancients allow still, with *Origen*, that *Josephus* did not, in the *Jewish* and *Christian* Sense, acknowledge *Jesus* for the *true Messiah*, or the *true Christ of God*, notwithstanding their express Quotation of that Clause in *Josephus*, as genuine. So that unless we suppose *Origen* to have had a different Notion of these Words from all the other Ancients, we cannot conclude from this Assertion of *Origen's*, that he had not those Words in his Copy. Not to say, that it is, after all, much more likely that his Copy a little differed from the other Copies in this Clause, or indeed omitted it intirely (as does *Cedrenus* Transcript, and the first Edition of *Epiphanius's* old Version omit it; and those only of all the Citations, Editions, and MSS. that I have heard of) than that he, on its Account, must be supposed not to have had the rest of this Testimony therein: Though indeed I see no Necessity of making any such Supposal at all. However, it seems to me, that *Origen* affords us four several Indications that the main Parts, at least, of this Testimony itself were in his Copy.

(1) When *Origen* introduces *Josephus's* Testimony concerning *James the Just*, that he thought the Miseries of the *Jews* were an Instance of the Divine Vengeance on that Nation for putting *James* to death instead of *Jesus*, he uses an Expression no way necessary to his Purpose, nor occasioned by any Words of *Josephus* there; I mean that they had slain $\tau\acute{o}\ \pi\rho\epsilon\phi\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\delta\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu$, that *Christ* which was foretold in the Prophecies. Whence could this Expression come here into *Origen's* Mind? when he

was

was quoting a Testimony of *Josephus* concerning the Brother of *Christ*, but from his Remembrance of a Clause in the Testimony of the same *Josephus* concerning *Christ* himself, that the Prophets had foretold his Death and Resurrection, and a vast Number of other wonderful Things concerning him?

(2) How came *Origen* to be so surprized at *Josephus's* ascribing the Destruction of *Jerusalem* to the Jews murdering of *James the Just*, and not to their murdering of *Jesus*, as we have seen he was, if he had not known that *Josephus* had spoken of *Jesus* and his Death before; and that he had a very good Opinion of *Jesus*: Which yet he could learn no way so authentickly as from this Testimony. Nor do the Words he here uses, that *Josephus* was not remote from the Truth, perhaps allude to any thing else, but to this very Testimony before us.

(3) How came the same *Origen*, upon another slight Occasion, when he had just set down that Testimony of *Josephus* concerning *James the Just*, the Brother of *Jesus* who was called *Christ*, to say, that it may be questioned whether the Jews thought *Jesus* to be a Man, or whether they did not suppose him to be $\tau\iota$ θεῶτερον, a Being of a diviner Kind. This looks so very like to the third and fourth Clauses of this Testimony in *Josephus*, that *Jesus* was a wise Man, if it be lawful to call him a Man, that it is highly probable *Origen* thereby alluded to them. And this is the more to be depended on, because all the unbelieving Jews, and all the rest of the Nazarene Jews esteemed *Jesus* with one Consent as a meer Man, the Son of *Joseph* and *Mary*; and 'tis not, I think, possible to produce any one Jew but *Josephus*, who in a Sort of Compliance with the Romans and the Catholick Christians, who thought him a God, would say any thing like his Being a God. I take this Argument to be a very strong one: Let the judicious consider it.

(4) How

(4) How came *Origen* to affirm twice, so expressly, that *Josephus* did not himself own, in the Jewish and Christian Sense, that *Jesus* was *Christ*? Notwithstanding his Quotations of such eminent Testimonies out of him for *John the Baptist* his Forerunner, and for *James the Just*, his Brother, and one of his principal Disciples? There is no Passage in all *Josephus* so likely to persuade *Origen* of this, as is the famous Testimony before us: Wherein, as he and all the Ancients understood it, he was generally called *Christ* indeed, but not any otherwise than as the common Name whence the Sect of *Christians* was derived; and where he all along speaks of those *Christians* as a Sect then in being, whose Author was a wonderful Person, and his Followers great Lovers of him and of the Truth; yet as such a Sect as he had not joined himself to. Which Exposition, as it is a very natural one, so was it, I doubt, but too true of our *Josephus* at that time. See Authent. Rec. Vol. II. p. 960. Nor can I devise any other Reason but this, and the parallel Language of *Josephus* elsewhere, when he speaks of *James* as the Brother, not of *Jesus* who was *Christ*, but of *Jesus* who was called *Christ*, that could so naturally induce *Origen* and others to be of that Opinion.

N. B. There are two remarkable Passages in *Suidas* and *Theophylact*, already set down, as citing *Josephus*; the former that *Jesus* officiated with the Priests in the Temple; the latter that the Destruction of *Jerusalem* and Miseries of the *Jews* were owing to their putting *Jesus* to death; which are in none of our present Copies, nor cited thence by any ancients Authors; nor indeed do they seem altogether consistent with the other more authentick Testimonies. However, since *Suidas* cites his Passage from a Treatise of *Josephus's*, called *Memoirs of the Jews Captivity*, a Book never heard of elsewhere;

where ; and since both Citations are not at all disagreeable to *Josephus's* Character, as a *Nazarene* or *Ebionite*, I dare not positively conclude they are spurious ; but must leave them in Suspence, for the farther Consideration of the Learned.

IX. As to that great Critick *Photius*, in the ninth Century, who is supposed not to have had this Testimony in his Copy of *Josephus*, or else to have esteemed it spurious, because in his Extracts out of *Josephus's* Antiquities it is not expressly mentioned. This is a strange Thing indeed ! that a Section which had been cited out of *Josephus's* Copies all along before the Days of *Photius*, as well as it has been all along cited out of them since his Days, should be supposed not to be in his Copy, because he does not directly mention it in certain, short and imperfect Extracts, no way particularly relating to such Matters. Those who lay a Stress on this Silence of *Photius*, seem little to have attended to the Nature and Brevity of those Extracts. They contain little or nothing, as he in effect professes at their Entrance, but what concerns *Antipater*, *Herod the Great*, and his Brethren, and Family, with their Exploits, till the Days of *Agrippa jun.* and *Cumanus*, the Governor of *Judæa*, fifteen Years after the Death of our Saviour : Without one Word of *Pilate*, or what happened under his Government : Which yet was the only proper Place in which this Testimony could come to be mentioned. However, since *Photius* seems therefore, as we have seen, to suspect the Treatise ascribed by some to *Josephus*, of the *Universe*, because it speaks very high Things of the eternal Generation and Divinity of *Christ*, this looks very like his Knowledge and Belief of somewhat really in the same *Josephus*, which spake in a lower Manner of him : Which could be hardly any other Passage than this Testimony before us. And since, as we have also seen, when he speaks of the *Jewish*

History of *Justus* of *Tiberias*, as infected with the Prejudices of the *Jews*, in taking no manner of Notice of the Advent, of the Acts, and of the Miracles of *Jesus Christ*, while yet he never speaks so of *Josephus* himself, this most naturally implies also, that there was not the like Occasion here as there: But that *Josephus* had not wholly omitted that Advent, those Acts, or Miracles: Which yet he has done every where else, as well as *Justus* of *Tiberias*, but in this famous Testimony before us. So that it is most probable, *Photius* not only had this Testimony in his Copy, but believed it to be genuine also.

X. As to the Silence of *Clement* of *Alexandria*, who cites the Antiquities of *Josephus*, but never cites any of the Testimonies now before us, it is no strange Thing at all: Since he never cites *Josephus* but once^o, and that for a Point of Chronology only, to determine how many Years had passed from the Days of *Moses* to the Days of *Josephus*. So that his Silence may almost as well be alledged against an hundred other remarkable Passages in *Josephus's* Works, as against these before us.

XI. Nor does the like Silence of *Tertullian* imply that these Testimonies, or any of them were not in the Copies of his Age. *Tertullian* never once hints at any Treatises of *Josephus's* but those against *Apion*^p; and that in general only, for a Point of Chronology. Nor does it any way appear that *Tertullian* ever saw any of *Josephus's* Writings besides; and far from certain that he saw even those. He had particular Occasion in his Dispute against the *Jews* to quote *Josephus*, above any other Writer, to prove the Completion of the Prophecies of the *Old Testament* in the Destruction of *Jerusalem* and Miseries of the *Jews* at that Time, of which he there discourses: Yet does he never

^o Strom. I. p. 341.

^p Apologet. C. XIX.

once quote him upon that solemn Occasion. So that it seems to me, that *Tertullian* never read either the *Greek* Antiquities of *Josephus*, or his *Greek* Books of the *Jewish* Wars. Nor is this at all strange in *Tertullian*, a *Latin* Writer, that lived in *Africa*: By none of which *African* Writers is there any one Clause, that I know of, cited out of any of *Josephus's* Writings. Nor is it worth my while in such Numbers of positive Citations of these Clauses, to mention the Silence of other later Writers, as being here of very small Consequence.

To conclude, The most Doubtful of all these Testimonies, as has been of late supposed, I mean that concerning our Saviour *Christ*, is attested to for genuine, as we have seen, by the probable Reference of *Justin Martyr*, about the Middle of the second Century; by the more probable Reference of *Origen*, about the Middle of the third; by a double express Citation of it by *Eusebius*, in the former Part of the fourth; by a loose Version of it out of *Josephus* by *Ambrose*, soon afterward in the same Century; by the express *Latin* Transcript of one of *Eusebius's* Citations of it made by *Rufinus*, in his Version of the *Ecclesiastical History*; by another express *Latin* Version of it out of *Josephus* by *Jerom*, and a *Greek* Version of that *Latin* Version by *Jerom's* learned Friend *Sophronius*; all three about the End of the Fourth or Beginning of the Fifth Century. As also we have it set down by *Isidorus of Pelusium*, the Scholar of *Chrysostom*, and *Sozomen* the *Ecclesiastical* Historian, both early in the Fifth Century. *Cassiodorus* also, and his Friend, supposed to be *Epiphanius Scholasticus*, give us two *Latin* Versions of it; the former out of *Sozomen*, the latter out of *Josephus* or *Rufinus*, early in the Sixth Century. We have the same Testimony plainly, though briefly, cited by *Anastasias* the Abbot in the Eighth Century. We have *Jerom's* Version of it repeated by *Freculphus Lexoviensis*; the whole set

down in *Greek* by *Hamartolus*, and by one *Macarius*, both in or about the Ninth Century; beside the imperfect Copy of Part of it by *Malela* the Chronologer, and the probable Allusion to it by *Photius*, and both in the same Ninth Century. We have *Sophronius's* *Greek* Version of *Jerom's* *Latin* Version repeated by *Suidas*, about the Tenth Century. We have an almost compleat Copy of it given us by *Cedrenus* in the Eleventh Century. We have a still more compleat Copy in *Zonaras*; the Substance of it in *Glycas*; three Copies of *Rufinus's* *Latin* Version, out of *Eusebius* *Greek*, in *Johannes Sarisburiensis*, *Gotfridus Viterbiensis*, and *Petrus Comestor*, all in the Twelfth Century. We have another Copy of *Rufinus's* *Latin* Version in *Vincentius Bellovacensis* in the Thirteenth Century. We have a compleat Copy of it in *Nicephorus Callistus* in the Fourteenth Century. We have also a clear Reference to it in *Hardmannus Schedellus*; and a new *Latin* Version of it in *Platina*; and a full Reference to it in *Trithemius* in the Fifteenth Century; all which Evidence has been already produced at large. To say nothing of the old *Latin* Version, as repeated by *Haymo* in the Ninth, by *Cunradus Urspergensis* and *Albertus Stadensis* in the Thirteenth Centuries, and by an anonymous *Bambergensis* MS. of an uncertain Age, &c. which to prevent tiring myself and my Reader, I have not here transcribed: But which are to be esteemed real Confirmations of all the former Allegations. And this, as we have proved, has been the Case of the Testimony, in all the past Ages of *Christianity*, and in all the several Countries of *Europe*, and wherever Learning and Books have appeared in *Christendom*; during the first Fifteen Centuries of the Church.

There is also another Argument for the Genuineness of this Testimony, belonging to all the past Ages, which is usually overlooked by learned *Christians*; though I think it no inconsiderable one:

one: And that is, the Contempt all the unbelieving *Jews* have ever shewn to *Josephus*; the best Historian, beyond Dispute, which their Nation ever bred, after the sacred Ones. What should be the Reason of this Contempt of the genuine *Greek Josephus*? And of that gross Pretence that the *Hebrew Josephus Ben Gorion* was the genuine *Josephus*, unless it were the Testimonies now under Consideration; and especially that concerning *Jesus Christ*? Which bears so hard upon the unbelieving *Jewish* Nation, as could not be endured by them. This seems to me indeed to be the principal Cause of their rejecting this excellent Author. Nor can I devise any other sufficient Reason for such his Rejection. Which if it be admitted for the true Reason, the Genuineness of these Testimonies, and especially of that concerning *Jesus Christ* will be thereby admitted to be perfectly undeniable. Nor are we quite destitute of Evidence, that when this Testimony had been inserted into a MS. of *Josephus* in *Hebrew*, whether it were into a *Hebrew* Version of his *Antiquities*, or into *Ben Gorion*, the later *Hebrew Epitome*, some *Jews* procured it to be erased out of it. Of which see *Ittigius's Prolegomena*, and *Dr. Cave's Historia Literaria*, Vol. II. under *Josephus*. And so far concerning the first Fifteen Centuries, before printing began.

Since printing began, we find this Testimony, I think, in every Edition, and in every Version of *Josephus*, in all Languages. Nay since *Gisanius* and *Osiander* started that Question in the Sixteenth Century; and *Tanaquil Faber* and *David Blondel* first wrote against it in the Seventeenth Century, all the remaining MSS. of *Josephus*, *Eusebius*, &c. have been carefully looked into and examined: And every one of them have been found to contain this Testimony; and almost every one to contain it in its proper Place, under the Government of *Pilate*; and every one to contain it without

without almost any considerable Variations whatsoever. Nor do we discover that any ancient Author, from the Days of *Josephus*, to those of *Gisanius*, pretended that he knew of any Copies in any Language without it, nor give us the least Reason to suppose they suspected it, or esteemed it as any otherwise than an Authority truly certain and undeniable.

To which must be added, the exact Agreement of its Style to that of *Josephus*; the high Probability there is, from the undisputed Testimonies about *John the Baptist* and *James the Just*, that *Josephus* must have given us some such Testimony concerning *Christ*; and the very great Probability there is, that *Josephus's* own private Opinion was that of the *Nazarene* or *Ebionite Jewish Christians*: To which Character it very well agrees in every Circumstance.

N. B. I having received since I first wrote these Observations, certain Information from Bishop *Chandler*, that Dr. *Richardson*, Master of *St. Peter's College* in *Cambridge*, had informed Bishop *Hare*, that he had seen a MS. of *Josephus* with the famous Testimony concerning *Christ* dislocated, and in a wrong Place, I desired a Friend of mine, formerly of that College, to procure me an Account of that Matter from their Master. The Answer to which Request was this: " According to your
 " Desire, I waited upon our Master, and made
 " such Enquiries concerning the Manuscript
 " of *Josephus* as Mr. *Whiston* Requests to be
 " resolved in. The Master at first made some
 " Apology for his great Age and Infirmities;
 " but upon Recollection, told me, that he
 " had seen such a Manuscript as Bishop *Hare*
 " mentioned; and that the Passage concern-
 " ing our Saviour was not in the Text, but in
 " the Margin: And to the best of his Me-
 " mory,

" mory, in the same Hand with that of the
 " Text. As to its Age, he cannot with the
 " least Certainty here determine ; having left
 " what he had of that Kind at *Eton*. The
 " Manuscript, when he saw it, was in *Isaac*
 " *Vossius's* Library at *Windsor* : Which has
 " since been sent into *Holland* : And where
 " any Part of it may be now seen he knows
 " not. " Hereupon, by the Means of Mr.
Wasse, I procured the following Answers from
Holland relating to the same Matter :— *En re-*
sponsum quod ab celeb. Burmanno accepi, cum eum
consuluissem de loco Josephi. Vidi duos Josephi Co-
dicēs, ex Vossiana huc delatos, primus, qui lati-
nam modo versionem continebat, locum illum cele-
brem de J. Christo exhibebat ; sed versionem cum
aliis conferendi occasio non erat : Ab illa quæ in
Havercampii est editione verbis non sensu discre-
pabat. Alter erat Græcus, sed recentioris ævi ;
Et quem editor nuperus etiam contulit : Qui ad
verbum exhibebat locum ut in editione illa ; nisi
quod in ultimis erat transpositio quædam unius al-
teriusque vocabuli, qualis Et in notis fuit obser-
vata.

What follows is from Mr. D'Orville, Professor in
Amsterdam. Scias me inspexisse Venetiis in Bib.
D. Marci Codicem Antiquitatum Josephi Seculi
XI. in cujus ultima pagina perscriptum erat te-
stimonium illud de servatore nostro. Separatim
erat scriptum : Sed tamen eadem plane manu. Est
in armario 3. notatus. 3. 3. 13.

This is all that I have yet learnt concerning this
 Matter. And since there is not the least Hint
 of any Addition or Interpolation by Hands later
 than those of the original Transcribers, nor
 any Notes of Doubt or Uncertainty, I am not
 satisfied of any other Mystery here, than of
 some Inadvertency of the Scribes, or perhaps
 of a marginal or separate Transcribing to make
 the

the Passage more remarkable, and more distinctly observable to the Readers.

Since therefore this is all no other than the true State of this Cause, I think every upright Judge that considers it, must declare, that this Testimony is not only evidently and undeniably genuine; but upon the whole, more evidently and more undeniably genuine than any other Clauses or Sections in *Josephus's* Works now extant whatsoever.

N. B. It will be here but reasonable to vindicate our Author *Josephus*, in a Point wherein several of the Moderns have dealt very hardly with him: I mean when they accuse him as flattering *Vespasian* with being the true *Messiah* of the *Jews*. Take the two Passages upon which this Accusation is built in *Josephus's* own Words. The former Passage is in his Book *De Bello*, VI. 5. 4. which is this: " If any one
" consider these things, says *Josephus*, he will
" find, that God exercises a Providence over
" Mankind, and by all Manner of Ways discovers to them beforehand what is for their
" Preservation: But that they perish by their
" own Folly, and their Misfortunes are voluntary. For the *Jews* made the Temple
" Foursquare, by the Demolition of the Tower
" of *Antonia*, while they had it written in
" their own Oracles, that *their City and the*
" *holy House should then be taken when the*
" *Temple should become Foursquare*. But what
" most of all excited them to the War, was
" an ambiguous Oracle, which was also found
" in the Holy Scriptures, that a certain Person, to arise about that Time out of their
" Countrey, should have the Dominion over
" the World. This they took to belong to
" themselves: And many of the wise Men
" were deceived by that Determination:
" While the Oracle designed the Dominion
" of

“ of *Vespasian*, who was proclaimed Emperor
 “ when he was in *Judæa*.” The second Pas-
 sage is in *Josephus*’s own Speech to *Vespasian*
 “ *de Bello* III. 8. 9. where he speaks to him
 “ thus : “ Thou supposest, O *Vespasian*, that
 “ thou hast taken *Josephus* only as a Captive :
 “ But I come to thee as a Messenger of greater
 “ Things. For if I had not been sent of God,
 “ I knew the *Jewish* Law ; and how it be-
 “ came a General of Armies to die. Dost thou
 “ send me to *Nero* ? For why ? Do the Suc-
 “ cessors of *Nero* unto thee still remain ? Thou,
 “ *Vespasian*, art Cæsar, and Emperor : Thou
 “ and this thy Son : Bind me now faster, and
 “ keep me for thyself. For thou, O Cæsar, art
 “ Lord, not of me only, but of Sea and
 “ Land, and of the whole Race of Mankind.
 “ But truly I am worthy of an harsher Pri-
 “ son, in order to be punished, if I rashly
 “ affirm this of God.⁹”

Now in all this we have not one Word of those
 Predictions relating to the *Messiah* ; which *Josephus*,
 in his famous Testimony concerning *Christ*, declares
 to be a vast Number ; but of one only, concerning
 the taking of *Jerusalem* and the holy House when
 the Temple should become *Foursquare* ; and one on-
 ly, which foretold that about that Time a very
 great Potentate should arise out of *Judæa*. Which
 last Prediction the other wise Men then interpreted
 as one of *Jewish* Extraction : But *Josephus* of *Vespa-*
sian, who was first proclaimed Emperor when he was
 in *Judæa* : Without the least Intimation that he
 thought him to be the *Jews Messiah*. All the *Jews*,
 with one Consent, ever expected that their *Messiah*
 was not only to arise in *Judæa*, and that of *Jewish*
 Parents in general, but to be of the Seed of Da-

⁹ See *De Bello* IV. 10. 7.

² *Matth.* ii. 1—6. *Joh.* vii. 42. *Deut.* xviii. 15—19:

vid; and of the Town of Betlehem where David was; and to be a great Prophet like unto Moses, and to come peculiarly for the Salvation, not for the Destruction of Israel: With a great Number of other Characters, entirely inconsistent with *Vespasian*. Which were those two particular Oracles or Predictions *Josephus* had here in his Eye, is hard to determine; since he does not name them. I suppose with *Reland*, that the first of them might be *Dan. ix. 26, 27.* as then read and interpreted by the *Jews*: As also that the second was no other than the famous Prophecy of *Balaam*, that a *Star should arise out of Jacob, and a Scepter out of Israel*. &c. *Numb. xxiv. 17, 18, 19.* *Josephus* ever looking on *Balaam* as a true Prophet.

N. B. It will also be here but reasonable to vindicate the same *Josephus* from another imputation, which has been lately laid upon him, viz. that when, in his second Book against *Apion*, § 16. he makes a Comparison between *Moses* the Jewish Legislator, and *Minos*, with other old Heathen Legislators, he slyly insinuates, that though *Moses* artfully pretended to a Divine Revelation, for the Laws he gave the *Israelites*; as did the other as to their own Laws; yet that this was only in the way of a pious Fraud: And that he did not himself believe that any such Divine Revelation was made to him. This is, I suppose, a New Hypothesis entirely; that our *Josephus*, after all his Zeal for *Moses*, and for the *Mosaick* Laws, should still believe him to be no better than a direct Cheat and Impostor. And as I suppose this Hypothesis to be entirely New; so do I venture to affirm, and that upon no small Acquaintance with *Josephus's* Writings, that the Hypothesis is entirely False, and entirely contrary to the whole Drift and Tenor of *Josephus* in all his Works. *Josephus* begins his Antiquities

tiquities with this most true and most useful Observation, that *Moses* did not act as did the Heathen Sages; he did not found a Government on human Contrivances, and to be guided by political Maxims: But laid his Foundation in the Belief of the Being and Attributes and Providence of the One true God, the Creator and Governor of the whole World; and in the Fear of that God to be deeply fixed in the Mind of the *Israelite* Nation; and their thorough Persuasion that God gave them the Laws by which they were to be governed; and that, by Consequence, those and only those would be happy who kept those Laws, and were in his Favour; and those and only those would be miserable who brake them and were under his Displeasure. *Josephus* always appears to give firm Credit to the most difficult Parts of the sacred Books, and assures us every *Jew* was brought up in that deep Veneration for them, that they were always ready to yield up their Lives rather than contradict them. He still gives his Assent to the Fall of *Adam*; the Translations of *Enoch*, and *Elijah*; to the Deluge of *Noah*; to the long Lives of the Patriarchs; to the Burning of *Sodom*, &c. as those Accounts stand in the sacred Writings: As also to the Scripture Prophecies, when they frequently come in his Way; with the Observation of their constant Completions all along afterwards, even down to his own Times. He pleads the Accuracy of the Prophet *Daniel's* Predictions, as compared with their Completions; and wonders how the *Epicureans* can bear up against such Evidence for Divine Providence. He thinks *Moses* so fully inspired, that he takes the Account in *Deuteronomy* of his Death, and unknown Place of Burial, not to have been ad-

ded by others afterward, as Expositors now generally do, but written by himself prophetically beforehand. He frequently declares his Belief in both good and bad Angels, or Dæmons, and their concern with Mankind; as also in Divine and Prophetick Dreams sometimes afforded eminent Persons; and professes to have had some such Dreams or Divine Communications himself: Of which we have already produced a remarkable Example about *Vespasian's* Succession to the *Roman* Empire before any in *Judæa* knew of the Death of *Nero* himself; much less of the Successions and Deaths of *Galba*, *Otho*, and *Vitellius*, who came between them: Whose Truth is also, as we have seen, fully attested to by *Suetonius* and *Dio*, the Heathen Historians. He has given us a large and invaluable Collection of the most ancient and most authentick Heathen Testimonies, strongly confirming the Truth and Divinity of the sacred Books of the *Old Testament*: Which he was enabled to do by the vast Number of ancient Pagan Writers which he perused and quoted, no fewer than 59. of which we have now preserved, even imperfectly, but 14. He had, indeed, contrary to the Body of his own Nation, most generous Notions as to the Freedom of Enquiry among all Sects whatsoever: And was utterly averse to all Tyranny, Persecution, and Oppression of Mankind: and was for giving all sober Men of every Party Liberty to think freely, and speak freely for themselves, as they thought proper, without taking Offence at one another. Yet do his own Sentiments always go along with the sacred Books, and the sacred History. Nay, what is most of all remarkable, this was all said and done by *Josephus*, under the most unpromising Circumstances of himself

self and his Nation possible: Or when *Jerusalem*, with its Temple and Temple Worship, was utterly destroyed; and when he himself was become a Captive at *Rome* under Idolaters. At which Time he did still firmly retain his Faith in God, in *Moses*, and in the Prophets; and even then said plainly, that *Daniel*, the *Jewish* Prophet, had long ago foretold that Destruction of *Jerusalem* by the *Romans*, which he saw: (As did *Jesus* of *Nazareth* interpret that Prophet also:) Nay, he farther intimated to observing Readers, that the *Jews* *Messiah* [or *Jesus* of *Nazareth*] the Stone cut out of the Mountain in the same Prophet, would in Time break that *Roman* Monarchy to pieces, and set up a better Kingdom, which should endure for ever.

N. B. If any are still offended with *Josephus's* frequent Permission of his Heathen Readers to determine as they should think proper concerning many of those Miracles which he relates from the *Jewish* Scriptures; as if he did himself therefore doubt of their Truth and Reality; which is become a very common Objection against him; Give me leave to make his Vindication in the apposite Words of the honest, the accurate, and the judicious Professor *Reland*: Who has this Note upon one of *Josephus's* remarkable Expressions of this Nature: I mean that concerning the miraculous Passage of the *Israelites* over the *Red-Sea*.

Let every one determine as he pleases] *Josephus*,
 “ says *Reland*, does not by this way of speaking,
 “ signify that he doubted whether what was said
 “ of the Passage of the *Israelites* through the *Red-*
 “ *Sea* were true or not: But he only makes use of
 “ these Words, in writing to *Gentiles*, that if

^s Matth. xxiv. 15. Mark xiii. 14.

“ this

“ this appeared incredible to them, they might
 “ enjoy their own Liberty of Belief; and not be
 “ thereby deter’d from reading farther what he was
 “ to deliver. For that he himself did not doubt
 “ of this is shewn sufficiently by the Manner of his
 “ Narration, and by his own Testimony, that he
 “ took it out of the sacred Volumes. He uses
 “ the same Manner of Speech, *Book III. Chap. 10.*
 “ After he had said, that it was falsely belie-
 “ ved that *Moses* and the *Israelites* were expel-
 “ led *Egypt* for Leprosy: *Let every one consider*
 “ *this as he pleases.* Did he therefore intend to
 “ say that this also was uncertain? [It being no
 “ other than that impudent Calumny which *Jose-*
 “ *phus* himself vehemently confutes and exposes at
 “ large, in his first Book against *Apion*, § 25—31.]
 “ So says he, when he speaks of *Moses’s* Ascent to
 “ Mount *Sinai*, *Book III. Chap. 4. Of this let every*
 “ *one think as he pleases.* And with the same Con-
 “ clusion does he end this [second] Book, where
 “ he treats of the Divinity of the Laws of *Moses*.
 “ He also uses the same Words before, *Book I. Chap.*
 “ *4.* where he relates how old *Noah* was when he
 “ died [950 Years:] And, as here, he produces
 “ Examples out of profane Histories, that the thing
 “ may appear the more probable to the *Gentiles*.
 “ So also *Book IV. Chap. 6.*] concerning *Balaam*. And
 “ afterward *Book VIII. Chap. 4.* when he had said
 “ that it was manifest that no other *Syrians* in *Pa-*
 “ *lestine* were circumcised but the *Jews*, yet does
 “ he add, *Let every one think of this as he pleases.*
 “ Thus does he conclude his X and XVIII Book
 “ with the same Words. Compare also *Book XII.*
 “ *Chap. 13* in the End, and *Book XIX. Chap. 1.*
 “ Now while he so frequently is wont to use these
 “ Words in his Books of Antiquities, I do not re-
 “ member that I have *once* met with them in his
 “ Books of the [*Jewish*] Wars. But if I should be
 “ mistaken [in saying they are *not once* met with
 “ there,]

“ there,] yet do I take the Cause why they are so
 “ often met with in the Books of Antiquities to
 “ be this, that he wrote those Books for the Use
 “ of the *Gentiles*: [while the other were, for certain,
 “ written for the Use of those of his own Nation
 “ that dwelt beyond *Euphrates*.] I might confirm
 “ this Interpretation of such Words as used of
 “ Things of the greatest Certainty in the Opinion
 “ of the Writers themselves, from other Writers;
 “ unless I thought the Matter plain by what I have
 “ already said.” So far Professor *Reland*.

N. B. As to any Pretence of *Forgery* which it has
 been supposed some *Catholick Christian* might
 here have been guilty of, with regard to *Jo-*
sephus's Testimony concerning *Christ*: And that
 as early at least as the Days of *Eusebius*, if not
 of *Eusebius* himself; I must say, it is the Ef-
 fect of the *grosslest Ignorance* and *Partiality*.
 Take what I have here to say now, in the
 Words which I have had two different Occa-
 sions to use formerly; some to Mr. *Anthony*
Collins, and some to Mr. *Moyle*. My Words
 to Mr. *Collins* are these. *

“ We are perpetually told of the *pious Frauds*
 “ of the *Primitive Christians*. Now though
 “ I am no Stranger to their Writings, I can,
 “ at present, call to mind but one such Ex-
 “ ample that was ever proved, and that was the
 “ Forgery or gross Interpolation of the *Acts*
 “ of *Paul* and *Thecla* still extant, *apud Grabe*
 “ *Spicileg. Sect. I. p. 87—128*. and made by a
 “ certain nameless Presbyter, at the End of
 “ the First, or Beginning of the Second Cen-
 “ tury. *Tertull. de Baptism. Sect. 17. & Hieron.*
 “ *de Scriptor. Eccles. in Paulo*. But what was
 “ the Consequence? He was convicted, and
 “ confessed it; and though he pleaded that
 “ he did it *out of Love to Paul*, he was de-
 “ graded

* *Proposals*, p. 15.

“ graded for it.” My Words to Mr. *Moyle* † are these : With which I shall conclude.

“ Let the guilty *Jews*, since the Days of *Josephus*, and the guilty Hereticks that followed *Simon Magus*, even as low as Antichristianism and Popery themselves, bear their own Burden of Forgery, Knavery, Corruption, and Interpolation of ancient Histories, and ancient Records : For they too plainly and undeniably deserve it. But let not the innocent earlier *Jews*, and particularly *Josephus* ; or the innocent *Catholick Christians*, before Antichristianism and Popery, bear any such Burden : For, so far as I can judge, and I speak it upon a full Examination, they have the least Reason to bear it of any Part of Mankind whatsoever, from the Beginning of the World to this Day.

† Thundering Legion, p. 46.

May 9. 1733.

WILLIAM WHISTON.

DISSER-

DISSERTATION II.

Proving that the Copy of the Books of the Old Testament laid up in Herod's Temple, and thence used by Josephus, the Jewish Historian, in his Antiquities, was no other than that most ancient Collection or Library made by Nehemiah, in the Days of Artaxerxes, the Son of Xerxes; and was free from the several Additions and Alterations made afterwards in the other Copies, which are now extant.

This appears by the Arguments following.

I. **T**HIS expressly told us, in the publick Epistle sent by the Jews of Jerusalem to their Brethren in Egypt, in the 144th Year before the Christian Æra, and preserved in the second Book of Maccabees, that as Judas Maccabæus had made a Collection of the sacred Books of the Jews after the Persecution by Antiochus Epiphanes; so had Nehemiah done the like long before it; and not very long after the Captivity of Babylon, and the Rebuilding the Jewish Temple by Zorobabel. The Words are these, *The same Things also are related in the Writings and Com-*

* See Authent. Records, p. 220—232.

† 2 Maccab. ii. 13, 14, 15.

*mentaries of Nehemiah : How he founded a Library, and gathered together the Acts of the Kings, and of the Prophets, and of David, and the Epistles of the Kings concerning the Holy Gifts. In like manner also Judas gathered together all those Things [Books] that were lost, by Reason of the War we had, and they remain with us. Wherefore if ye have need thereof, send some to fetch them unto you. Nor is there Reason to doubt but such authentick Collections made by Governors of the Jewish Nation, would naturally be repositied in the Jewish Temple : (Whence * Grotius justly concludes that Nehemiah's Library itself was erected in that very Temple :) And would there be preserved, and thence removed into Herod's Temple, when it was rebuilt. Out of which Temple, as I have elsewhere proved, † from Josephus's own Words, he received that Copy which he made use of in his Antiquities. And because this is the great Foundation of my present Proposition, take the Evidence at large, in the Terms I formerly gave it. “ It well deserves our farther
 “ Remark, that Josephus, when he wrote his Anti-
 “ quities, seems not only to have had the Use of
 “ one or more ordinary Hebrew Copy, but pro-
 “ bably of the most authentick Copy in the whole
 “ Nation: I mean that which had been laid up in
 “ the Temple itself. Which very Book seems to
 “ have been given him, or however the Use freely
 “ allowed him after the Destruction of the Temple,
 “ and when he wrote his Antiquities. For thus stand
 “ his own Accounts. “ Titus Cæsar, says Josephus,
 “ when the City of Jerusalem was taken by Force,
 “ persuaded me frequently to take whatever I
 “ pleased out of the Ruins of my Countrey: For
 “ he told me that he gave me leave so to do. But
 “ there being nothing that I much valued now my
 “ Countrey was destroyed, I only asked of Titus*

* In Loc.

† Essay on the Old Testament, p. 190—195.

— Liberty

“ Liberty for myself and my Family, as the only
 “ Comfort now remaining in my Calamities: *I al-*
 “ *so had the Holy Books by his Concession.*” — From
 all which Facts laid together 'tis plain, that either
Josephus had the Authentick Copy of the Holy
 Books, that was found in the Temple given him
 by *Titus* entirely; or at least that such Authentick
 Copy was at his Command in the Emperor's Pa-
 lace at *Rome*; in which City he wrote his Anti-
 quities. And if we compare these Things with
 his own Assertion,— that two of the Accounts
 he had given [*viz. that of the Miracle of Water*
*out of the Rock, and of the Sun's standing still;*²]
 and one of them even of a Miracle not contain-
 ed in the *Pentateuch*, but in *Josbua*, was extant
in the Scriptures laid up in the Temple, we shall
 see Reason to believe, not only that he still made
 Use of the *Hebrew* Copies in general, but even of
 that very most authentick Copy of all, which used
 to be laid up in the Temple at *Jerusalem*.*

Whether the *Pentateuch* made a Part of *Nehemiah's*
 Collection, the Text of the *Maccabees* does not di-
 rectly inform us: Though one cannot easily be-
 lieve it was wanting in his Library. Possibly *Ne-*
bemiah supposed the vulgar Copies of the *Penta-*
teuch perfect enough, and thought there was little
 Occasion for that operose Collection which he per-
 ceived necessary about the other Books and Pa-
 pers.

N. B. Though it may be an Objection to the
 authentick Nature of this Epistle of the *Jews*
 at *Jerusalem*, that the Festival of *Dedication* in
 the Days of *Nehemiah*, (the Observation of
 which is therein recommended to the *Jews* in
Egypt) is there said to have been *after he had*
*builded the Temple and the Altar**, of which
 our Copies of the Book of *Nehemiah* say very

* Antiq. III. 1. 7. V. 1. 17.

* 2 Macc. 1. 18. Neh. ii. 8.

little ; yet is this Objection taken away by the better Copy of *Josephus* : Who informs us, that *Nebemiab* desired of the King to let him go, not only to *build the Walls of Jerusalem*, but to *finish the Building of the Temple also*. And introduces *Nebemiab*, in his Speech to the whole Body of the *Jews* in the Midst of their Temple, informing them, of the King's grant to him of leave, not only to *build those Walls*, but to *finish that Temple also*. Which Testimonies are strong Attestations to the Truth of this Epistle.

II. That *Josephus's* Copy was not a little different from even the *Samaritan* and *Septuagint* Copies, as they stood in his Age ; and much more from the *Masorete* Copy, as it has been since the Days of *Barchocab*, is most evident. That his Copy was, generally speaking, more perfect and authentick than those other Copies, will certainly appear by a critical Comparison of them all along ; and has been frequently observed and proved in my *Essay towards restoring the true Text of the Old Testament* ; and in my *Supplement to the literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies*. And that this Copy of *Josephus* was not a common Copy, but one laid up in the Temple, we know from his own Affirmations, just now set down. What Bible then could this be, but that which we know was collected by *Nebemiab*, about 520 Years before *Josephus* had his Copy out of *Herod's* Temple, and 540 before he wrote his *Antiquities* ? And this in the same City *Jerusalem* ; and, in all Probability, repositied by him in its Temple also ?

III. That *Josephus* followed a better Copy of the Historical Books, written after the *Babylonish* Captivity, I mean of *Esdra*s, of *Nebemiab*, and of *Esther*, than either the present *Masorete* Copy, or even the *Septuagint* Version contains, appears by the particular Character of those Books, or of the Materials

rials out of which they were composed, in this very Letter of the *Jews*: viz. that they principally contained the *Epistles of the Kings of Persia*, concerning their sacred Donations to the People of the *Jews*. Of which *Epistles* we have the fewest Accounts and Copies in the *Masorete Bible*; more in the *Septuagint Version*; and most of all in *Josephus's Antiquities*.

IV. It is evident that *Josephus* made use of an uncommon Copy, or Materials for a Copy of *Nebemiab*, as to the Building the Walls of *Jerusalem*, not under *Artaxerxes*, but *Xerxes*, contrary to all our *Masorete* and *Septuagint* Copies; and this still in such a certain Agreement with the Chronology of *Ptolemy's Canon*, and of *Daniel's LXX Weeks*; (which *LXX Weeks* could never be cleared till this Copy was made use of;) as is very extraordinary. See *Lit. Accom. of Proph. Supplem. p. 56—93*. This implies, that *Josephus* had a most authentick Copy of this Book of *Nebemiab*, or of Part at least of those Materials out of which it was afterward composed: And such an one as neither the *Masoretes*, nor the *Septuagint* Interpreters appear to have had. All which exactly agrees to this Collection or Library of *Nebemiab's* before us, and to no other. I am still obliged to speak cautiously concerning the Histories after the Captivity; without determining concerning them, whether they were already reduced into the Books of *Esdra*s, *Nebemiab* and *Esther*; or whether they were then only a Collection of Materials, out of which those Books were afterward to be composed. For these three Histories being all, in a Manner, contemporary with *Nebemiab*, and the two last intirely so, 'tis a great Question whether their Materials were digested into Books as early as the Collection of *Nebemiab's* Library, or not. The Words here are, that this last Part of the Library had, not these Books, but only the *Epistles of the Kings concerning*
the

the Holy Gifts. Which way of speaking, somewhat different from what went before, seems to me rather to imply authentick Papers, out of which the Books were to be afterward composed; than the Books themselves, when they were already composed.

V. There is a large Branch of the Book of *Nebemiah*, which all our *Masorete*, *Septuagint*, and vulgar *Latin* Copies give us as Part of his Book, tho' it be rather an Appendix to the Book of *Esdra*; and is undoubtedly later than the rest of the Book of *Nebemiah*: [Being neither in his Name, in the first Person^b; as is the rest of his Book: Nor continued with it in the vulgar *Latin*; but exhibited as a distinct History when it is introduced; and containing Accounts as late as *Jaddua*, who was High Priest under *Alexander* the Great, long after the Days of *Ezra* and *Nebemiah*.] The Branch I mean is from *Chap.* vii. 70. to *Chap.* xii. 26. Now since it is plain that this entire Branch could not be in *Nebemiah*'s Copy nor Library; and yet is in all the other Copies; we may hence draw a strong *κρίσις* or Character to determine, whether *Josephus* followed the other Copies, or that of *Nebemiah* himself only. If he own this Branch, he must have used some later Copy: If not, he must have used *Nebemiah*'s. Now it is very plain, and taken Notice of by me several Years ago, that though *Josephus* abridges some of the foregoing and following Parts of this Book, yet does it not appear that he had a Syllable out of that Branch. See *Essay on the Old Testament* p. 55. which plainly shews us, that he made use of *Nebemiah*'s own Copy, and of no other.

VI. *Josephus*, in his first Book against *Apion*, § 8. is so peculiarly express, as to the very different Regard the *Jews* paid to the Holy Books before and after the Reign of *Artaxerxes*, the Son of *Xerxes*; or, which is much the same, before and af-

^b See Suppl. to Lit. Accompl. of Proph. p. 57, 58, 59.

for *Nebemiab's* Government; to which time he reckons the constant Succession of the Prophets extended, but not longer: [Which so different Regard does however no where else appear in any other original Author; no not in the *Septuagint* Version itself:] That it is exceeding remarkable; and affords us no small Foundation for Conjecture, that the Bible he had out of the *Jewish* Temple ended in the Days of *Nebemiab*: And, in all Probability, was no other than *Nebemiab's* own Collection or Library. Which Argument will be the stronger, if we consider,

VII. That the Prophecy of *Malachi*, a Book ever owned as sacred by the whole *Jewish* Nation, was written after the Days of *Artaxerxes* and *Nebemiab*, as I have elsewhere proved. This Book will therefore afford us another *χαρακτήριον* or Character of *Josephus's* Copy. If he had *Malachi* in his Bible, he must have had a later Copy, or such an one as the *Masoretes* or *Septuagint* give us: But if he had not *Malachi*, he must have had this earlier Bible of *Nebemiab*. Now 'tis clear that *Josephus*, though he mention by Name *Isaiab*, *Jeremiab*, *Baruch*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, *Jonab*, *Nabum*, *Haggai*, and *Zachariab*, never says one Word of *Malachi*, or of his Prophecy: Which yet, had it concluded his most authentick *Old Testament*, as it hath done the most authentick *Old Testament* of the rest of his Nation in all the later Ages, he would hardly have omitted. Especially since he omits no other *Hebrew* Book, whether Historical or Prophetical, in or after the *Babylonish* Captivity. Nor if *Josephus* had read *Malachi* in his Copy, would he surely have ended his Succession of the Prophets, and his Catalogue of the most sacred Books of his Nation, with *Artaxerxes* the Son of *Xerxes*; but either with *Darius Notbus*, or *Artaxerxes Mnemon*: In one of

whose Reigns, in all Probability, this Prophet wrote his Prophecy. Which Character therefore determines, and that with great Probability, that it was *Nebemiah's* Bible which was used by *Josephus*, and no other.

VIII. This farther appears by *Josephus's* entire Omission of the Book of *Canticles*, and I think only of that Book, in the whole *Old Testament*, now extant, earlier than *Nebemiah*: Which yet is in all our *Masorete*, *Septuagint*, and other Copies: Tho' it can make no just Pretence to the Title of a sacred Book: As I have ^d elsewhere proved. Nor is this other than a considerable *κεκτήριον* or Character, that *Josephus* used no later Copy than that of *Nebemiah*. There being not the least Sign that the *Jews* so early admitted that strange Book into their Canon: Though it appear some of them, at least, did so when the *Septuagint* Version was made, about 200 Years afterward. I mean this if their later Copies be in that Case like the original ones.

IX. *Josephus*, by his perpetual using the *Hebrew* Original of the first Book of *Apocryphal Esdras*, as we now call it, instead of the *Hebrew Canonical Ezra*; which is indeed a Kind of Epitome, or rather an imperfect Copy of the other, though perhaps as old as the *Septuagint* Version, affords us another *κεκτήριον* or Character, which Bible he used: I mean one older than that *Hebrew Canonical Ezra*: Which he never once cites in his large and particular Accounts of that entire History. I say only perhaps this *Canonical Ezra* is as old as the *Septuagint* Version. For though it stand now in all our Copies of that Version, yet we having no Citations from it, that I know of, till long after the Days of *Barbocab* ^e, I am doubtful about such its Antiquity. Possibly it may be of equal Date with our

^d Suppl. to the Essay on the *Old Testament*, p. 25—29. See the entire Supplement.

^e Essay on the *Old Testament*,

p. 50—53.

imperfect *Hebrew Nebemiah* and *Esther*; and that they were all distinct original Compositions from some such authentick Papers which *Nebemiah's* Library contained; but those very imperfect and ill digested. It also contains some *Chaldee* Chapters; as does our *Hebrew Daniel*. For which *Chaldee* Chapters of these two Books we have, I think, no Evidence older than *Barchocab*. So that I a little suspect this *Hebrew* and *Chaldee Ezra* to be no earlier than his Time. By all which it appears, that *Josephus's* Bible was different from and elder than the present *Masorete* and *Septuagint* Bibles; or, in other Words, that it was *Nebemiah's* Bible, and no other.

X. But the principal *χειρίδιον* or Character that *Josephus's* Bible was that of *Nebemiah*, is the general State of the Book of *Nebemiah* itself, in all our later Copies, as compared with *Josephus's* Accounts of his History. If *Josephus* had used a Copy of *Nebemiah* that extended to all the Acts of his Life, and in particular during the most publicly remarkable Part of it, his twelve Years Government of *Judæa*, from the 20th to the 32^d of King *Artaxerxes*; as our Copies now do; we might suppose he had made use of a Copy of this Book like ours, and as late or later than those twelve Years Government extended to. But if he used only *Nebemiah's* own Papers, as they stood collected in his own Library, he could proceed no farther than that Part of his Life which preceded that Collection. Now this is the certain State of *Josephus's* History of *Nebemiah*. For though he intimates his Knowledge of *Nebemiah's* later glorious Acts, and particularly, as we have seen, of his *finishing the Temple*, yet do his distinct Accounts reach no farther than the Days of *Xerxes*; and contain very little more than the Building the Walls of *Je-*

rusalem; or about three Years of the latter End of that Reign of *Xerxes*: Without a Syllable of his twelve Years Government under *Artaxerxes*. Accordingly, while the third Book of *Esdra*s in the compleat *Greek* and *Latin* Edition, has 434 Verses; and the Book of *Esther* has about 270 Verses; and in all Editions the Book of *Nebemiah* has 406 Verses, *Josepbus*'s Account of *Esdra*s is no less, in the *Cologn* Edition, without Notes, than 14 Pages. And his Account of *Esther* is almost 10 Pages: in a near Proportion to their Largeness. While his whole Account of *Nebemiah*, which by a just Proportion, ought to be above 13, is no more than 2 Pages. Nor indeed does *Josepbus* contain any Part of this History that is in our present Copies any farther than what is in Part of the 1st, in Part of the 2^d, in Part of the 4th, in Part of the 12th, and in Part of the 13th Chapters, while he omits Part of the 1st, Part of the 2^d, all the 3^d, Part of the 4th, all the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, Part of the 12th, and Part of the 13th Chapters. And what Parts of our Copies are not omitted, are yet told us by him in such a different and better Manner, and with such a different and better Chronology, as demonstrates he did not take even those small Parts from our present Copies, but from other original Papers, not a little different from them, and more authentick than they were. Which Things are highly worthy the Consideration of the Learned.

N. B. To confirm this Argument from the great Disproportion there is in *Josepbus*'s Account of the Book of *Nebemiah*, as compared with his Accounts of the other Historical Books in the Canon of the *Old Testament*, I observe, that while there are one with another, 382 Pages of the same Edition of *Josepbus*, which correspond to 436 Chapters of our Bible, from *Genesis* to *Esther*; which is almost a Page to a Chapter.

Chapter. We have in *Nehemiab* only those 2 Pages, to those 13 Chapters. Which is a Proportion utterly unexampled, I think, thro' *Josephus's* whole eleven Books of Antiquities : Which include that entire History. Nor is there, I believe, room for any other Solution than what I have here given the inquisitive Reader.

N. B. Since therefore *Josephus's* Materials for the Historical Books, after the Captivity, reach as far as the entire History of *Esther*, i. e. to the 12th of *Artaxerxes*, the Son of *Xerxes*; and yet did not extend to the Government of *Nehemiab*, from his 20th to 32^d Year, we ought to state the Time of the Collection of *Nehemiab's* Library after the 12th, but little or nothing later than the 20th of *Artaxerxes*. Accordingly I should, all Things considered, determine the Time to that very 20th of *Artaxerxes*, upon *Nehemiab's* return to his Government; that he and his People might have authentick Copies of those sacred Books ready at Hand, by which his Authority, and their Obedience were to be directed ever afterwards.

XI. The Order of the several Parts of the *Pentateuch*, and of other Histories of the *Old Testament*, is in *Josephus* so frequently different from, and better than either that in the *Masorete* Copy, or the *Septuagint* Version, or even sometimes than that in the *Samaritan Pentateuch* itself, that he must have had an earlier, and more uncorrupt Copy than were any of the others.

XII. Not only the Order, but many Portions of sacred History themselves are so much fuller and more exact, consistent and agreeable with Chronology, with

^b *Natural Religion*, and with one another, in *Josephus*, than they are in any of our other Copies, that he must have had an earlier, and more uncorrupt Copy than any we now have. These two last Observations have forced themselves upon me in my late careful Comparison of the *Masorete* Copy, in our common Bibles, with the eleven first Books of *Josephus's* Antiquities. And I dare boldly affirm, that when other learned *Christians* will take the Pains to make the like careful Comparison, they will hardly be able to avoid making the same Observations. And what immense Light such an entire Comparison of the other Copies with *Josephus's* Antiquities, and their Improvements and Corrections from those Antiquities, will cast upon many of those sacred Books, and indeed upon the entire *Old Testament* History, and upon many of the Prophecies also, I had much rather other learned Men should discover by their own Trials, than take my bare Affirmations or Observations for the Truth of it.

XIII. There are none of those Passages in *Josephus's* Antiquities which appear not to be so ancient as the Times of *Moses*, or *Joshua*, or of the other original sacred Historians; though they be in the *Masorete Hebrew*, and *Septuagint* Version; and even several Times in the *Samaritan Pentateuch* itself. Which Passages have afforded a plausible Handle to many, since the Days of *Aben Ezra*, to suppose those Books themselves in general later than the Authors to whom they are ascribed. This is an Observation, as I think, entirely New, and of very great Consequence: And will therefore well deserve a through Consideration. I shall trace all the several Expressions or Additions at large, in the Order they lie in our Bibles, and compare the Places all along with *Josephus*.

(1) *Gen. xii. 6*, when *Abram* was newly 'come

^c See *Suppl. to Lit. Accomp. of Proph. p. 75, 76, 77.*

out

out of *Mesopotamia*, it is taken Notice of in the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Texts, and in the *Septuagint* Version, that *the Canaanite or Canaanites were then in the Land*. And

(2) Again *xiii. 7*, *That the Canaanite and Perizite dwelt then in the Land*. Which could hardly be remarked, as worth Notice, that the Land of *Canaan* had *Canaanites* in it, till after *Joshua* had driven those *Canaanites* out of it: Which we all know was not done till after the Death of *Moses*. Now we have both these Histories in *Josephus*: But not a Syllable of either of these Passages. Nor are these Passages either quoted or alluded to, that I know of, in any other Book afterwards, before the making of the *Septuagint* Version. Which is to be supposed of the other Examples to be here given, without any especial Repetition.

(3) *Gen. xiv. 18*, it is said, not only in all the other Copies, but in *Josephus* also; that *Abram* pursued after those that had taken *Lot* Prisoner, *unto Dan*, which Place is by some supposed to be the old City *Laisb*, called afterwards *Dan*ⁱ, from a Colony of the Tribe of *Dan* there settled, considerably later than the Death of *Moses*. But then, as it is no way certain that by *Dan* is here meant the City of *Laisb*, afterward called *Dan*; or indeed any City at all; so *Josephus* directly assures us, that the Place whither *Abram* pursued his Enemies was rather one of the Fountains of *Jor-Dan*, which was called *Dan*, than any City whatsoever. And as to the City *Laisb*, when it was rebuilt by the *Danites*, and named *Dan*, *Josephus* mentions that its rebuilding, and this its new Name; but seems to have had no Notion that this was the Place whither *Abram* pursued his Enemies. And if we observe, that in *Josephus's* Copy it was the *Fifth Night* that *Abram* overtook them; and that, upon their Defeat, it

ⁱ *Judg. xviii.*

was the *Second Day* afterward when they were fled no farther than *Hobab, on the left Side of Damascus*: And consider, that when an Army flies for their Lives they march much swifter than at other Times; we shall look for this Place *Dan* nearer the Sea of *Galilee*, than either to the Fountains of *Jordan*, or the City *Laisb*, which was not far from them. Nor indeed do I take it to be any other than that *Dan*, in the Tribe of *Nephtali*, which was situate thereabout: *Josb. xix. 38.* with 1 *Kings xv. 20.* and 2 *Chron. xvi. 4.* If indeed the *Masorete Hebrew*, and *Roman Copy* of the *Septuagint* could be depended on, God shewed *Moses* from Mount ^k *Nebo*, *all the Land of Gilead unto Dan*: Which must then have been a Place about the Fountains of *Jordan*, according to *Josephus's* Opinion. But since both the *Samaritan* and the *Alexandrian Copy* of the *Septuagint*, as well as *Josephus* have no such Text there, I still prefer this Conjecture, that it was *Dan* near the Sea of *Tiberias* whither *Abram* pursued his Enemies, and no other: Which might well be its Name in the Days of *Moses* himself. As for that common Phrase, *From Dan even to Beersheba*, as the entire Length of the Land of *Canaan* in after Ages; we meet not with it till after the City of *Laisb* was called *Dan*^l, and for certain means no other Place in all the *Old Testament*. But this is of no Consequence in our present Enquiry.

(4) *Gen. xix. 37*, *Moses* informs us, that *Moab*, the Son of *Lot*, by his elder Daughter, was the Father of the *Moabites, unto this Day*: And (5) [†] *38.* that *Ammi* or *Ammon*, the other Son of *Lot*, by his younger Daughter, was the Father of the *Ammonites, unto this Day*. These Expressions are in all Copies, and in *Josephus* also, and very well do they suit to the Days of *Moses*, under whose Go-

^k *Deut. xxxiv. 1.*

^l *Judg. xx. 1.*

vernment these *Moabites* and *Ammonites* were considerable Nations, with which he and the *Israelites* were greatly concerned, during the forty Years abode in their Neighbourhood, in the Wilderness.

(6) *Gen.* xxvi. 26, 32, 33, our present Copies inform us, that the City *Beersheba*, or the *Well of the Oath* was so called, because *Isaac* there sware to *Abimelech* King of *Gerar*, to *Abuzza*, and *Phicol* his Courtiers, at a Well dug by him, without the least Notice that this Well was dug in the Days of *Abraham*, and that there *Abraham* sware unto the same ^m *Abimelech* King of *Gerar*, and to the same *Abuzza* and *Phicol* his Courtiers, about ninety Years before. Certainly this is a later Addition or Repetition: Certainly this is a Mistake of *Isaac* for *Abraham*. But then we have not a Word of this here in *Josephus*.

(7) 'Tis said by some, that the City *Hebron*, so called in the *Pentateuch* itself, had not that Name till it was given to *Hebron*^a, the [Grand] Son of *Caleb* by *Joshua*, after the Death of *Moses*. But certainly this is a great Mistake. *Hebron* was given to ^o *Caleb* himself, and to none else. Upon which, probably, it was that *Caleb's* Grandson was called *Hebron*. Nor does *Josephus* give us the least Intimation that the Name *Hebron* was of so late an Original as the Days of *Joshua*. I have elsewhere suggested that *Kiriath Arba* was built, or rather rebuilt by *Hebron*, the second King of ^p *Tanis* or *Zoan*; and thenceforward called after his own Name. Whereas its Name, when *Abraham* came first thither, was no other than *Kiriath Arba*: Tho' long before *Moses* wrote the *Pentateuch*, its Name was changed to *Hebron*. It being built or rebuilt seven Years before *Zoan* in *Egypt*. See *Gen.* xxiii. 2.

^m *xxi.* 22, 30, 31, 32.

^o *Josh.* xiv. 14. *xxi.* 11, 12.

^a *Gen.* xxiii. 2. *Num.* xiii. 22.

^p See Authent. Rec. p. 971.

Josh. xiv. 15. Judg. i. 10. and my Chronological Table.

(8) *Gen. xxxii. 32*, we learn, that the Children of *Israel* eat not of a certain Sinew of the Thigh of Animals, *unto this Day*. This is in all Copies, even in *Josephus* also; and was equally true when *Moses* and when *Josephus* wrote, and is equally true at this very Day.

I pass over (9) the Clause in the *Septuagint*, *Gen. xxxv. 4.* that *Jacob* destroyed the Teraphim or Idols, which some of his Family had brought out of *Mesopotamia* with them, *to this very Day*, as being in no other Copy or Version whatsoever.

(10) *Gen. xxxv. 20*, the Text informs us, that the Pillar set up by *Jacob* upon *Rachel's* Grave was there, *unto this Day*: Of which *Josephus* is entirely silent: As indeed he omits the setting up of the Pillar itself also: Though we are sure her Grave or Monument was known in the Days of *Samuel*, about 600 Years afterwards, *1 Sam. x. 2.*

(11) *Gen. xxxvi. 31, &c.* [and *1 Chron. i. 43, &c.*] we have a compleat Catalogue of the Kings that reigned in the Land of *Edom*, before there reigned any King over the Children of *Israel*. Which Language seems to imply, that at the Time of writing this Catalogue, there had been one or more Kings that reigned over the Children of *Israel*: Of whom yet King *Saul* is supposed the first, long after the Days of *Moses*. And the Number of the Kings of *Edom* here being eight, 'tis supposed they might possibly reach as low as *Saul*. But I take all this to be very uncertain. God had lately promised or foretold that Kings should come out of *Jacob's* Loins: *Chap. xxxv. 11*, *Moses* himself is said, both in the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan*, to have been King in *Jeshurun*, *Deut. xxxiii. 5.* The Interval between *Joshua* and the Judges is described both in the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint* as a State of Anarchy, *when there was no King in Israel*, *Judg. xvii. 6. xviii. 1.* as an unusual

usual Thing in those Days, and among that People. And *Abimelech*, one of the Judges, denotes my Father the King, and the Text assures us, *Judg. ix. 6.* that all the Men of *Shechem* went and made *Abimelech* King. Nor does it at all appear that these Kings of *Edom* reigned till the Days of *Saul*. Eight Kings might reign not much above a Century, and the last Reign might be over before the *Exodus* out of *Egypt*. Nay we really know that *Edom* was governed by Dukes, who succeeded these eight Kings, when the *Israelites* came first into the Wilderness, *Exod. xv. 15.* However, certain it is, that all the latter Part of *Gen. xxxvi.* from *Ver. 20* to the End, including these Kings of *Edom*, is omitted in *Josephus*. So that we can have no Evidence that he had here either our present Language or our present Catalogue of the Kings of *Edom*, in his Temple Copy.

(12) *Gen. xlviii. 26.* we are assured, that the Law which *Joseph* made for the *Egyptians*, that the King should have the fifth Part of all the Lands of *Egypt*, excepting those belonging to the Priests, continued, *unto this Day*: Or in *Josephus's* Phrase, *unto the later Kings*, or *to the Kings afterwards*. This agrees well to the Days of *Moses*; when there had been about nine Kings of *Egypt*, in *Manetho*, since the coming of *Jacob* into that Countrey. See my *Chronological Table*.

(13) *Exod. vi. 26, 27.* after an Enumeration of the Ancestors of *Moses* and *Aaron*, in the twelve foregoing Verses, we have this Addition, *These are that Aaron and Moses to whom the Lord said, Bring out the Children of Israel from the Land of Egypt, according to their Armies: These are they which spake to Pharaoh King of Egypt, to bring out the Children of Israel from Egypt: These are that Moses and Aaron.* These Words do not, for certain, look like the Words of *Moses* himself; no more than does the whole Genealogy seem to fit the Place wherein it

now stands in all our Copies. Accordingly *Josephus* entirely omits, not only these two Verses, but the whole Genealogy in this Place.

(14) *Exod. xvi. 32, 33, 34.* *Moses* enjoins *Aaron* to lay up the Pot of Manna *before the Lord*,—*before the Testimony*, to be kept for their Generations: And *Aaron*, in Obedience thereto, lays it up there accordingly, and this before the Tabernacle, with its Tables of the Testimony, and Ark of the Testimony were in being. Sure this is a Dislocation. And if we consult *Josephus*, we shall see, that the last five Verses of this Chapter, wherein both this Command, and its Execution are related, are themselves wholly omitted: And so very probably he had them not in his Temple Copy in this Place.

(15) *Exod. xvi. 35.* it is said, that *the Israelites did eat Manna forty Years; until they came to a Land inhabited they did eat Manna; till they came unto the Borders of the Land of Canaan.* This Text is in all Copies, even in *Josephus's* Copy also; and exactly agrees to the End of the Life of *Moses*: And might easily be written by himself, as *Josephus* would naturally suppose; or might be added by *Joshua*, when he also added the History of the Death of *Moses*, a little afterwards.

(16) *Numb. xii. 3.* we have this Verse, by way of Parenthesis, inserted into the *Masorete Hebrew*, into the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, and into the *Septuagint Version*, *Now the Man Moses was very meek, above all the Men who were upon the Face of the Earth.* This great Commendation of *Moses* for his unexampled Meekness does by no Means, to be sure, look like *Moses's* own writing. Let another Man praise thee, and not thine own Mouth; a Stranger, and not thine own Lips: *Prov. xxvii. 2.* is an undoubted Maxim of Wisdom in *Solomon*; and not likely to be transgress'd by *Moses*, the meekest of Men. *Josephus* does not give us the History into which this Parenthesis is inserted: So we cannot have

have any Reason to suppose it was in his Copy. And indeed, to add this farther, I have not observed that in *Josephus's* frequent and great Commendations of *Moses*, he ever particularly celebrates this his extraordinary *Meekness*; as did those that used the later *Hebrew*, or the *Septuagint* Copies, wherein this Commendation of *Moses* is extant. I mean ^a the Father of *Sirach*; the Apostles, or *Clement* in the Constitutions; and *Ignatius* in his Epistles both to the *Ephesians* and *Magnesians*. So that 'tis most probable *Josephus's* Copy had neither this History, nor this Clause inserted into it; and that both were Additions later than the Days of *Nebe-miab*.

(17) *Numb. xxi. 1, 2, 3.* we have this Account, that *Arad the Canaanite, which dwelt in the South of Palestine, Westward of Jordan, fought against Israel, and took some of them Prisoners*; and that, on the *Israelites* devoting their Cities to utter Destruction, as God had commanded them, God heard their Prayer, and the People, with their Cities, were utterly destroyed; And that utter Destruction gave the Name *Hormab*, of which that is the Signification, to the Place afterwards. This History plainly belongs to the Time after the Death of *Joshua*, *Judg. i. 16, 17.* and there we find it also in its proper Place. But how it came into our *Hebrew*, *Samaritan*, and *Septuagint* Copies of the Book of *Numbers*, I cannot tell. For it is certain, that the *Israelites* could have no War on that Side *Jordan* during the Life of *Moses*. 'Tis true, we are farther told *Numb. xxxiii. 4.* that when *Aaron* died at Mount *Hor*, King *Arad* heard of the coming of the Children of *Israel*: Which is all that could belong to the Days of *Moses*. However, *Josephus* entirely omits this History, in this mistaken Place; though it be touch'd upon by him in its proper Place of the

^a *Ecclus. xlv. 4. Constitut. vi. 3. vii. 7. Ignat. ad Eph. § 10. ad Magnel. § 12.*

Book of Judges. So that it still appears *Josephus's* Copy was purer and more uncorrupt than any of those other Copies now extant.

(18) *Numb. xxxii. 41. and Deut. iii. 14.* we are told, that the Countrey or Cities *Bashan-Havoth-Jair*, were so named by *Jair* the Son of *Manasseh*, unto this Day. Now all this rather belongs to the Days of the Judges, one of which was this *Jair*, of the Tribe of *Manasseh*, as *Josephus* agrees: But not a Syllable of this in *Josephus*, till the Days of the Judges; nor even there a Syllable of the Continuance of the Names of these Cities or Villages, unto this Day.

(19) *Deut. i. 1.* We have this Text, *These are the Words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond Jordan*: and Chap. iii. 8. *Moses* is introduced again speaking thus, *And we took at that Time out of the Hand of the two Kings of the Amorites, the Land that was beyond Jordan.* This Expression *beyond Jordan* is in these and other Places in the *Masorete Hebrew*, and *Samaritan* Texts, as well as in the *Septuagint* Version. Yet because the Place where *Moses* now was could not yet be stiled the *Land beyond Jordan*, till the *Israelites* had been on the other Side of *Jordan*, which did not happen till after the Death of *Moses*, our *English* and other Versions have ventured to render the Original, directly against its natural Signification, *on this Side Jordan.* *Josephus* is so far from acknowledging so strange an Expression, as we find in our Copies, that he introduces *Moses* here telling the *Israelites*, very truly, that God did not permit him to go *beyond Jordan*, nor to enjoy the good Things he would there bestow upon them: As it were in Opposition to all our other and later Copies.

(20. 21) *Deut. ii. 21.* in the lxxii. we are informed, that the *Ammonites*, conquered and dwelt in the Land of the *Repbaim*, instead of the *Repbaim* unto this Day. And ver. 22. in the *Hebrew* and *Sama-*

Samaritan, that the Children of *Esau* conquered and dwelt in *Seir*, instead of the *Horites*, even unto this Day. Of whom *ver. 12*, the same Succession is described; with this Addition, that these Children of *Esau* conquered and dwelt in the Stead of the *Horites*, as *Israel* did unto the Land of his Possession, which the Lord gave unto them: As if these Accounts were written after the *Israelites* were settled in the Land of *Canaan*; or after the Death of *Moses*. But of all this we have not a Word in *Josephus*.

(22) *Deut. xxxiv. 6*. it is affirmed, that no one knows of the Place where *Moses* was buried, unto this Day. But no such Affirmation appears in *Josephus*.

N. B. I do not here set down the three last Verses of the Book of *Deuteronomy*^{*}, concerning *Moses*, that there arose no Prophet like him afterward, which though extant in all Copies, and in the Copy of *Josephus* also, are plainly no Part of either *Moses's* or *Joshua's* writing; but a very proper Appendix to the *Pentateuch*: And could not have any other Author than one of the later *Jewish* Prophets, or the Governors of the *Jewish* Church, about or after the *Babylonish* Captivity. Nor is it at all improbable, but *Ezra* and *Nebemiah*, with one or both their contemporary Prophets, *Haggai* and *Zechariah*, might add this remarkable Clause, to prepare the *Jewish* Nation to look hereafter from *Moses* and the old Prophets, to the great Prophet like unto *Moses*, or to King *Messiah*[†]: To whom they were entirely to hearken, upon the Penalty of *Excision* from among their People. However I venture to say that common Readers ought not to be deluded by seeing these Verses stand as a Part of the original Book of *Deuteronomy*, which are

* *Deut. xxxiv. 10, 11, 12.*

† *Chap. xviii. 15—19.*

so clearly no other than a later Appendix to it.

(23) *Josb.* iv. 9. we meet with this Assertion, that the twelve Stones, which were set up by *Josbua* in the Midst of *Jordan* when they came over it, are there, *unto this Day*. But no such Assertion is in *Josephus*.

(24) *Chap.* v. 9. we are acquainted, that the Place of *Josbua's* Encampment was called *Gilgal*, *unto this Day*. Of which we find no Sign in *Josephus*. To say nothing of the Addition to the Anathema on the Builder of *Jericho*, in the lxxii. *Josb.* vi. 26. as evidently taken from its Completion long afterward, *1 Kings* xvi. 34. and not elsewhere, and wanting in the *Hebrew*. I observe that,

(25) *Chap.* vi. 25. it is noted, that *Rabab* the Inn-keeper, who saved the Spies at *Jericho*, dwelt in *Israel*, *unto this Day*. But no such Note is set down in *Josephus*.

(26. 27) *Chap.* vii. 26. it is related, that the *Israelites* raised over *Achar* or *Achor* a great Heap of Stones, *unto this Day*— and that therefore the Name of that Place was called the Valley of *Achor*, *unto this Day*. But no such Language appears here in *Josephus*.

(28) *Chap.* viii. 28. we find this Passage, that *Josbua* made *Ai* an Heap for ever, a Desolation, *unto this Day*. But we find no such Thing in *Josephus*. And

(29) *Chap.* viii. 29. that the Carcase of the King of *Ai* was cast in at the entring of the Gate of the City *Ai*, and a great Heap of Stones raised thereon *unto this Day*; without the least Countenance from *Josephus*.

(30) *Josb.* ix. 23. in the *Hebrew* we find, that the *Gibeonites* were doomed by *Josbua* and the Elders, to be *Hewers of Wood and Drawers of Water for the House of God*, or for the *Temple*: Which was not built till long after the Days of *Josbua*. Now whether

whether the *House of God* here denote the *Temple*, or only the *Tabernacle*, which was already erected in the Days of *Josbua*, I shall not now enquire: Because *Josephus* has no such Expression, But only that they were doomed to be *publick Servants*: As both the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint* Copies have it, *ver. 21* and *27.* or that they should be *Hewers of Wood and Drawers of Water to all the Congregation, unto this Day.* Which was probably the old Reading in *ver. 23.* also. Now the *Septuagint* have no mention of the *House of God* here: And *Josephus* acknowledges not the Addition, *unto this Day.*

(31) *Josb. x. 10.* it is said, that the *Canaanites* were chased along the way that goeth up to *Bethboron.* This Name of *Bethboron* is in the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint*, as well as in *Josephus*: Yet are we told *1 Chron. vii. 24.* that this City *Bethboron* was built by *Sherab*, the Daughter or Grand-daughter of *Ephraim*, after the *Israelites* were settled in *Canaan*; and not at the Time when it is here mentioned. Now this is so common in old Times, to say a City was built when it was rebuilt, or greatly improved, that 'tis not worth our while to make any farther Apology for such an Expression. See *Judg. xviii. 28, 29. xxi. 23. 1 Kings xii. 25. 2 Chron. xi. 5—10.* Nor do I see any Reason to believe that *Bethboron* had not that Name till this Reedification by *Sherab*; but suppose it the old Name when *Josbua* first came into the Land of *Canaan.*

(32) *Chap. x. 14.* we have these Words, upon Occasion of the Sun's standing still, that there was *no Day like that before it nor after it.* This Expression looks like a much later Addition. But then we have not a Syllable like it in *Josephus*, upon this Occasion.

(33) *Chap. x. 27.* we find this History, that the Children of *Israel* laid great Stones in the Caves Mouth of five Kings of the *Amorites*, *until this very Day.* But this is not mentioned by *Josephus.*

(34) *Josb.*

(34) *Josh. xiii. 13.* we learn, that the *Gesharites* and *Maachabites* dwelt among the *Israelites*, unto this Day; but nothing of this is in *Josephus*.

(35) *Josh. xv. 13—19.* we have a particular Account of *Caleb's* driving away the *Anakims*, and taking *Debir*, and *Kiriath Sepher*, and giving his Daughter *Achsah* to Wife to *Othniel* the Son of *Kenaz*, who took it: with other Occurrences; all belonging to the Interval after *Joshua's* Death: And they are accordingly repeated in their proper Place of the Book of *Judges**. This Clause is in both our *Masorete* and *Septuagint* Copies; but not a Syllable of it in *Josephus* under *Joshua*; but only, in its proper Place, under the *Judges*. But it would be too tedious to give here all the Examples of Books, Clauses, and Facts dislocated both in the *Masorete*, and even the *Samaritan Hebrew* Copies, and in the *Septuagint* Version, but set in their proper Places by *Josephus*, from his better Copy. See many of these taken Notice of in my *Essay on the Old Testament: And Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies, with its Supplement*.

(36) *Josh. xv. 63.* we are informed, that the *Jebusites* dwelt with the Children of *Judab* at *Jerusalem*, unto this Day. But we have no mention of this in *Josephus*.

(37) *Josh. xvi. 10.* we read, that the *Canaanites* dwelt among the *Ephraimites*, unto this Day. And in the *Septuagint* we have this much later Addition. *Until Pharaoh King of Egypt came up, and took the City [Gazer] and burnt it with Fire, and he persecuted the Canaanites, and Perizzites, and the Inhabitants of Gazer; and Pharaoh gave it in Dowry to his Daughter: [as 1 Kings ix. 15.]* But of all this *Josephus* says nothing—And so far the additional Passages to the *Pentateuch* and to *Joshua* are found to be peculiar to our other and later Copies, and to have

* *Judg. i. 10—15.*

had no Place in the *Temple* or *Nebemiab's* Copy made use of by *Josepbus*. And so far is abundantly sufficient for the Vindication of the original Texts of *Moses* and *Joshua* from the Objections arising from these later Additions, of the Continuance of certain Names and Memorials *until this Day*, or until some Time considerably later than the History itself. Now the *Pentateuch* and *Joshua* are the principal Books liable to this Sort of Exceptions. For as to other Books, that contain the History of several hundred Years, such Expressions *might* properly enough be added about ancient Facts when those Books were composed and published; without any such Suspicion upon them. Though it will appear, as we go along, that *Josepbus* had not very many of those Expressions in his Copy; unless when they were equally true in his own Time, as they were at the Time of the original Books Publication. To proceed therefore to the remaining Examples.

(38) *Josh. xix. 27*, we have, in both our Copies, mention made of a Place or City in the Borders of the Tribe of *Aser*, called *Cabul*: Which is supposed to be in that Countrey which was not called *Cabul* till the Days of *Solomon*: As we find *1 Kings ix. 13*. where it is added, that this Countrey retained that Name of *Cabul*, *unto this Day*. But then *Josepbus* has neither that Name in the History of *Joshua*, nor a Syllable of its retaining that Name, *unto this Day* in the History of *Solomon*.

(39) At the End of the Book of *Joshua*, in the *Septuagint*, we have this additional Clause, that the *Israelites* put the flint Knives, wherewith *Joshua* circumcised the Children of *Israel* in *Gilgal*, into *Joshua's* Monument at *Timnath Serah*; and that they are there *unto this Day*. But of this not a Syllable in any other Copy.

(40) *Judg. i. 21*. We are assured, that the *Jebusites*

sites dwelt with the Children of Benjamin, unto this Day. But this is not in *Josephus*.

(41) And *Ver. 26.* that *Luz*, so named between the Death of *Joshua*, and *Othniel* the first Judge, was the Name of a Town, *unto this Day.* But this is not in *Josephus*.

(42) And *Ver. 27.* The *Septuagint*, and they only say, that the Tribe of *Manasseh* did not possess *Bethel* [*Bethsan*] which is *Scythopolis*. This must be a very late Addition; though perhaps earlier than the *Septuagint* Version, as all the Learned very well know. But we have nothing of this in *Josephus*.

(43) *Chap. vi. 24.* we learn that *Gideon's* Altar is *unto this Day* yet in *Ophrah* of the *Abiezrites*. But of this *Josephus* says nothing.

(44) *Chap. xv. 19.* we are told, that the Place where *Sampson* slew the *Philistins* with the Jawbone of an *Ass*, was called *Lebi*, *unto this Day.* This Text was in *Josephus's* Copy, and was true, not only when the Book of *Judges* was published, and when *Josephus* wrote, but as late as the Days of *Glycas*, or the 12th Century of Christianity also. See *Reland's Palestina* in *Lechi* and *Eleutheropolis*.

(45) *Chap. xviii. 12.* it is said, that the Place where the 600 *Danites* first pitched their Camp in the Tribe of *Judah*, when they went upon the Expedition to *Laish*, was called *Mabane Dan*, or the *Camp of Dan* *unto this Day.* But of this *Josephus* makes no mention.

(46) *Chap. xviii. 30.* it is said, that the Idolatry of *Micah* lasted, *until the Day of the Captivity of the Land*, i. e. either to the Captivity of the Ark by the *Philistins*, in the Days of *Eli*; or to the Captivity of the Ten Tribes in the Days of *Nebuchadnezzar*:

(47) And *Ver. 31.* that it lasted *all the Time that the House of God was in Shiloh*, which favours the first Interpretation. However both these Clauses seem to me to be Additions, later than the Book of

of *Judges* itself. But then, *Josephus* omits the entire History of this Idolatry of *Micah*; and so we can have no Reason to suppose that he had either of those Clauses in his Copy.

(48) 1 *Sam.* v. 5. we learn, that the Priests of *Dagon*, and his Worshippers, in Memory of their Gods falling upon the Threshold of his Temple before the Ark of the true God, *did not tread on that Threshold unto this Day.* But nothing of this is in *Josephus*.

(49) *Chap.* vi. 8. that the Stone on which the Inhabitants of *Bethshemesb* sacrificed, upon the Arks return from the Countrey of the *Philistins*, remained to this Day, in the Field of *Joshua the Bethshemite.* But not a Word of this in *Josephus*.

(50) *Chap.* vii. 15. it is said, that *Samuel* judged *Israel* all the Days of his Life: Which could hardly be written by *Samuel* himself. Accordingly the Clause is wanting in *Josephus*.

(51) *Chap.* ix. 9. we have a Parenthesis added, both in the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Copies; *Before time in Israel, when a Man went to enquire of God thus he spake, Come and let us go to the Seer: [For he that is now called a Prophet, was before time called a Seer.]* How far these last Words are true, or who inserted them, I know not. But so far I know, that we have no Footsteps of their Truth in any other Text, but rather the contrary. The Word *Seer* is never once before used: And the Word *Prophet* very often, in all the preceding Books of the *Old Testament*. However, *Josephus* is so far from confirming this Parenthesis, that, on the contrary, he uses no other than the Word *Prophet* through this whole History. As for myself, I suspect a Disorder in the present Text; from what Hand soever it came, and that it originally ran thus: *Before time in Israel, when a Man went to enquire of God, thus he spake: Come and let us go to the Prophet. For he that is now [sometimes] called a Seer, was before [always] called a Pro-*
P 2
phet.

1 bet. Which exactly agrees to the Fact, even in all our present Copies of the *Old Testament*; where in the Word *Prophet* is always used before this Time, and after it both the Words are used promiscuously.

(52) *Chap. xxvii. 6.* the History informs us, that *Ziklag*, given to *David* by *Achish* King of *Gath*, pertaineth to the Kings of *Judah* unto this Day. Which could not well be written till after the Days of *David*. Accordingly this Addition is wanting in *Josephus*.

(53) *Chap. xxx. 25.* we learn, that *David's* Ordinance to divide the Spoils equally among those that went out to the Battel, and those who continued in and guarded the Camp, was a Statute and an Ordinance for *Israel* unto this Day, or when this History was published. And this Ordinance is mentioned by *Josephus* also, and I suppose lasted not only to the Times of the *Maccabees**, but also to his own Time. And no wonder, since 'tis rather a Revival, an Explication, and Execution of an old Law of *Moses*†, than the enacting of a new one. Nor do I know that *David* had, at this Time, any Power to enact new Laws; though he were certainly obliged to obey the old ones.

(54) *2 Sam. iv. 3.* it is said, that the *Beerotbites* fled to *Gittaim*, after the Death of *Saul*; and were Sojourners there unto this Day. But we meet with no such Addition in *Josephus*.

(55) *Chap. vi. 8.* and *1 Chron. xiii. 11.* it is observed that the Place where *Uzzab* was slain for taking hold on the Ark, being no Priest. See *Numb. iv. 15.* was called *Perez Uzzab*, or the Breach of *Uzzab* to this Day. This is in all the Copies, even in *Josephus*; and might well retain its Name, not only when these Books were published, but when *Josephus* himself wrote also.

* *2 Maccab. viii. 29, 30.*

† *Numb. xxi. 35, &c. Josh. xxi. 8.*

(56) Chap. viii. 7. in the *Septuagint* Version we have this Addition, to the Series of the History, as to those Bracelets or Shields of Gold which *David* took from the Servants of *Hadadexer*, King of *Zobab*, and brought them to *Jerusalem*, that *Sousakim*, or *Shishac*, King of *Egypt*, took them, when he came up to *Jerusalem*, in the Days of *Rehoboam* the Son of *Solomon*. And the same Clause was in *Josephus's Hebrew Copy*: And was a very proper Addition when these Books of the *Kings* were finished and published, sometime after the Reign of *Rehoboam*. Though how it has come to pass that our present *Masorete Hebrew* wants this Clause, which was extant in *Josephus's Hebrew*, I cannot determine.

(57) Chap. xiv. 27. we have just such another Addition, in the *Septuagint*, as to *Tamar* the Daughter of *Absalom*, that she became the Wife of *Roboam* the Daughter of *Solomon*, and bare him *Abia*. And the same Clause was in *Josephus's Hebrew Copy*: And in both with the same Propriety: Though in the same manner wanting in our present *Hebrew* also.

(58) Chap. xviii. 18. we are inform'd, that *Absalom's* Pillar or Place was so called, unto this Day. But this is omitted in *Josephus*.

(59) Chap. xxiv. 25. in the *Septuagint* Version we have this Addition to the Series of the History: Concerning the Altar on which *David* offered Sacrifices at the Threshing Floor of *Araunah* the *Jebusite*: And *Solomon* added to [enlarged] the Altar at last; for it was too little at first. But of this we have not a Syllable either in our *Masorete Hebrew* Copies, or in *Josephus*.

(60) 1 *Kings* viii. 8. and 2 *Chron.* v. 9. we read, that the Ark, or its Staves were in the most Holy Place of *Solomon's* Temple, unto this Day. Or when the Books of *Kings* and *Chronicles* were published. Of which additional Clause *Josephus* says not a Word. But we must note here, that this Clause could not be true in the Days of the Author of the Book of *Chronicles*,

Chronicles, unless that Book were published before the carrying away the Ark in the Days of *Zedekiah*. Whence the two last Verses of that Book, which are *verbatim* the same with the two first of *Ezra*, concerning the Decree of *Cyrus* for the Return of the *Jews*, are plainly a later and a very inaccurate Addition: As indeed the last eight Verses of Chap. xxxv. and the whole xxxvi Chapters seem to be such an Addition, and in our present Copies, a very inaccurate Addition also.

(61) Chap. ix. 21. and 2 *Chron.* viii. 8. we read, that *Solomon* laid a Tribute upon the Remains of the seven Nations of *Canaan*, *unto this Day*: But this Clause is not in *Josephus*.

(62) Chap. xii. 19. and 2 *Chron.* v. 19. we find this Passage, that *Israel* rebelled against the House of *David*, from the foolish Answer of *Rehoboam* to the twelve Tribes at *Sichem*, *unto this Day*: Tho' *Josephus* has no such Passage.

(63) 2 *Kings* ii. 22. it is said, that the Waters at *Jericho* were healed by *Elisha*, *unto this Day*. This Addition seems here to have been in *Josephus* also. Nor was it less true when he wrote, than when these Books of *Kings* were published; nor is it less true at this Day: As the Travellers * inform us.

(64) 2 *Chron.* xx. 26. we learn that the *Valley of Berachab* or *Blessing*, was so called from the solemn *Blessing* of God there, after *Jehoshaphat* had received a wonderful Deliverance therein, *unto this Day*. *Josephus* has all the rest of the History, but without those additional Words *unto this Day*.

(65) 2 *Kings* viii. 22. and 2 *Chron.* xxi. 10. we are informed, that *Edom* revolted from under the Hand of *Judab*, *unto this Day*: Which is omitted in *Josephus*.

(66) Chap. x. 27. we are informed, that *Jehu* and

* See Maundrel, p. 79.

his Forces made the House of *Baal* a Draught-house, unto this Day. But *Josephus* says nothing of this Addition.

(67) *Chap. xiv. 7.* we are assured, that *Amaziab* King of *Judab* took *Selah* or a Rock by War, and called the Name of it *Joktheel* unto this Day. But we have nothing of this Addition in *Josephus*.

(68) *Chap. xvi. 6.* we are told, that the *Syrians*, who had taken *Elatb* from *Abaz*, dwelt there, to this Day: But we have no such Addition in *Josephus*.

(69) *Chap. xvii. 23.* and *1 Chron. v. 26.* we learn, that *Israel* was carried Captive to *Affyria*, unto this Day: Without any Confirmation of it from *Josephus*.

(70) *Ver. 34, 41.* we learn farther, that the *Samaritans* or *Cutbites*, that came into the deserted Parts of the Countrey of the ten Tribes, feared the Lord, and served their graven Images, both their Children, and their Childrens Children; as did their Fathers, so do they to this Day. And this they did when this Book was published, and in the Days of *Josephus*, as he here and elsewhere informs us; nay so did they still lower, till the Days of *Nero*: As I have shewn elsewhere, *Lit. Accomp. of Propb. p. 155, 156. Proposals, p. 13.*

(71) *2 Kings xviii.* and *2 Chron. xxxv. 20. ap. lxxii.* we read, that after *Hezekiah*, as well as before him, there was none like him among all the Kings of *Judab*. And

(72) The very same is said of *Josiah*, *xxiii. 25.* without the least Confirmation to either of the Clauses in *Josephus's* History of those Kings.

(73, 74) *1 Chron. iv. 41, 43.* we read of certain *Simeonites*, that in the Days of *Hezekiah* King of *Judab*, smote a certain People, of *Arabia*, perhaps, and devoted them to Destruction unto this Day: And that others of them, 500 in Number, smote the rest of the *Amalekites* that were escaped, and dwelt there
unto

unto this Day. But *Josephus* entirely omitting all the former nine Genealogical Chapters of this Book, we can have no Pretence for supposing these Additions to have been in his Copy.

(75) *Chap. v. 18—22.* we read, that the Tribes beyond *Jordan* made War with the neighbouring *Arabians*, and conquered them, and made a great Slaughter of them, and dwelt in their Stead until the Captivity [under *Pul*, and *Tiglath Pul Assar*, ver. 26.] This Addition was a very natural one when these Books of *Chronicles* were published, long after those Captivities: But cannot be discovered to have been in *Josephus's* Copy, for the Reason before-mentioned.

(76) 2 *Chron. xxxv. 25.* and 3 *Esdras i. 32.* we are inform'd, that the *Israelites* made Lamentation for *Josiah*, unto this Day: And that this was given out for an Ordinance, to be done continually in all the Nation of *Israel*. And well might this be added when this last Branch of this Book of *Chronicles*, and when *Esdras* were written, after the Captivity: Though as to *Josephus*, who takes all out of this *Apocryphal Esdras*, and not out of the *Canonical Ezra*, we find no such Clause in his History.

(77) 2 *Kings xxiii. 32.* and 2 *Chron. xxxvi. 2.* in the lxxii. we are informed that *Jeboabaz* did evil in the Sight of the Lord, according to all that his Fathers had done. And 2 *Kings xxiii. 37.* and 2 *Chron. xxxvi. 5.* in the lxxii. we have the same Expression of his Brother *Jeboiakim*, while yet of their four immediate Ancestors *Hezekiah*, *Manasses*, *Amon*, and *Josias*, the first and last were among the best of the Kings of *Judah*. So that one may doubt of the Propriety of the Expression in both these Cases: And that not only because it is sometimes drop'd in the *Hebrew*, but because it is entirely omitted by *Josephus* in both these Histories.

Upon the whole, there does not appear so much

as one of these Sort of Passages, which ought to be supposed later than the Original finishing and publishing of the Historical Books of the *Old Testament*, in all the Antiquities of *Josephus*: And by Consequence we have not the least Evidence that his Temple Copy had any one of them. However the Reader will excuse me if I conclude this Catalogue with two Observations of a somewhat different Nature from most of the foregoing; though not foreign to my present Design.

(78) 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6. we have this Account of *Jehoiakim's* End, that *Nebuchadnezzar* bound him in Fetters to carry him to *Babylon*: Or as the *Septuagint* have it, and brought him to *Babylon*, and in the same *Septuagint* is added, *Ver. 18.* in Contradiction thereto, that *Jehoiakim* slept with his Fathers, and they buried him in *Ganofan*, [*i. e.* with *Manasseh*, in the Garden of *Uzza*, 2 Kings xxi. 18.] How these Accounts agree one with another, or with *Jeremiah's* Predictions, that the *Babylonians* should be so far from giving leave to bury the Bodies of the *Jews* their Enemies, that they should give them for Meat to the Fowls of the Heaven, and for the Beasts of the Earth, and that none should fray them away. Jer. vii. 33. that, in particular, they should bring out the Bones of the Kings of *Judah*, and the Bones of the Princes, and the Bones of the Priests, &c. out of their Graves, and should spread them before the Sun, and the Moon, and all the Host of Heaven, with which they had committed Idolatry: That they should not be gathered, nor be buried, but should be for Dung upon the Face of the Earth, Chap. viii. 1, 2. Nay that, in a most especial Manner, Chap. xxii. 19. this *Jehoiakim* should be buried with the Burial of an Ass, drawn and cast forth beyond the Gates of *Jerusalem*: How these Accounts and the Predictions of *Jeremiah* agree, I am not able to say. But then, as I have already observ'd p. 110. *præ*, and as he that will compare the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint*, will soon see; the eight last Verses of the xxxv, and all
Q the

the xxxvi Chapter of the second Book of *Chronicles*, are too late and too inaccurate Additions to that Book to be depended on, against any sacred Authority. Nor do I know that *Josephus* ever owns any Facts peculiar to these Chapters. Which seem indeed no other than a Part of the present Book of *Ezra*, never owned by *Josephus*. However, so far is plain, that *Josephus's* Temple Copy of the sacred History agrees here with *Jeremiah's* Predictions. And he thence assures us, that the Carcass of *Jeboiakim* was ordered to be *cast out unburied before the Walls of Jerusalem*, exactly according to the Predictions of *Jeremiah*. Which Account highly deserves the Consideration of the Inquisitive.

(79) 1 Sam. xvii. 50—58. we have an Account, both in the *Hebrew* and *Septuagint*, that King *Saul*, when he saw *David* go forth against *Goliath* the *Philistin*, did not know him, or at least did not know who was his Father: Which seems a later Addition. For it looks like an Impossibility that *Saul* should be so ignorant at that Time, considering how long *David*, the Son of *Jesse*, had been his Servant and Armour-bearer; and that by *Jesse's* his Father's Leave: As we read in the End of the foregoing Chapter: and the following Chapter, is but the History of about forty or fifty Days. But of this whole History, and of what follows it, in the next five Verses, Chap. xviii. 1—5. we have not a Word in *Josephus*. And indeed this seems to me a Portion of true History, but entirely dislocated or removed out of its proper Place; and that it happened, not when *David* went out against *Goliath*, but when he had formerly gone out against some other of the same *Philistins*. For we read, that when *David* was first sent for to live with *Saul*, he was recommended to him as a *mighty valiant Man*, and a *Man of War*: Chap. xvi. 18. To which Character so early *Josephus* agrees also. Now it is very probable, that this martial Character of *David* was not acquired without some martial

tial Exploits, and those against the *Philistins*, the known Enemies of his Nation and Religion. At one of which earlier Exploits it is most likely *Saul* made this Enquiry before us, and not at the Time specified in our Copies. Nor is the Occasion of this Dislocation unobvious, *viz.* that it might be at a Time when *David* had slain another *Philistin*, and had that *Philistin's* Head in his Hand. Which Likeness of Circumstances might easily induce a later Compiler to place it to this Time, when he had *Goliath's* Head in his Hand, long afterward. However, *Josephus's* perfect Silence about this History, and about what follows it; and his Connection of the foregoing Victory to the Song of the Women Dancers, *Chap. xviii. 6.* are plain Indications, that either some Mistake or some Transposition has here happened in our later Copies; of which he saw no Footsteps in his Temple Copy.

N. B. We have in many Places of the historical Books of the *Old Testament* Quotations of, or References to other old *Jewish* Books, or to other Records not now preserved; as confirming or enlarging the Histories contain'd in our Bible. Whether these Quotations or References were original, or were afterward added, I cannot certainly say. Only I must here take Notice, that I have never observed the least Traces of any of these Quotations or References in all *Josephus's* Antiquities.

COROLLARY 1. It appears by what has been already proved, that the voluntary Additions, Omissions, or Dislocations which we may observe in the present Copies of the *Old Testament*, are of a bare human Original; and that we have no Evidence of any such till after the Days of *Nehemiah* and *Xerxes*, or indeed during the constant Succession of Prophets among the *Jews*. For this deserves to be particularly remarked, that these *Additions* appear in almost every historical Book of the *Old Testament*,

Testament, till the Days of *Nebemiab*, but no farther. Nor has either the Book of *Nebemiab* or *Esther*, in any Copy one Example; and, indeed, the Books of *Ezra* and *Esdras* have but one such Example in our other Copies, and not one in *Josephus's* Copy; as we have seen already: Altho' there were, otherwise not less Occasions for inserting them into those, than into the other historical Books of the *Testament*.

COROLL. 2. Yet are most of these later additional Passages, which speak of many of the old Names of Places and Monuments of that Nation, as still in being, at this Day, or after the Days of *Nebemiab*, i. e. many hundred Years after most of the Histories themselves were written, strong Attestations to the Truth of those Histories; and great Evidence that such Histories were all along publickly owned to be true by the *Jewish* Nation.

COROLL. 3. It is therefore now incumbent upon the learned *Christians*, and especially upon the Bishops and Pastors of the Church, to publish better and more authentick Editions and Versions of the *Old Testament*, than has hitherto been done. I mean with the Text of the *Pentateuch* according to the *Samaritan*; the Text of the rest according to the *Septuagint* Version; together with the various Readings of *Josephus*, and of the *Masorete Hebrew*: Which are all the original Remains of those Books now extant among us.

COROLL. 4. No learned and judicious Commentators ought hereafter to pronounce about any Books or Clauses of Consequence and Difficulty in the *Old Testament*, without consulting the Remains we now have of these four several Editions of those Holy Books; Especially not without consulting the Antiquities of *Josephus*, who used the best of them.

N. B. There is among many other Things that *Josephus's* Copy appears to want, but which are

are in the other Copies, one Omission of so important a Nature as ought to be particularly taken Notice of in this Place: I mean of the heinous Sin of the Golden Calf, or the idolatrous Worship paid to it in the Wilderness, by the People of *Israel*. What makes it stranger is this, that *Josephus's* Account is not only negative, by a bare Omission; but positive, by affording an exact Coherence without it, nay such a Coherence as is plainly inconsistent with it. And what still makes it the more surprizing is, that *Josephus* frequently professes, in these Antiquities, neither to *Add to* nor *Take away from* the sacred Books which lay before him. And when he thought proper to digest many of the Laws of *Moses* into a regular System, and this only in an Order different from that in which they were delivered, and in which they stood in the *Pentateuch*, he does not venture upon that Procedure but with great Caution, and with giving a distinct Intimation of it: That so he might not incur any Blame among his Brethren of the *Jewish* Nation, as having made some unwarrantable Alteration in their Bible. Accordingly he, in the most solemn Manner, appeals to all original Records, sacred or profane, and to those that please to compare his Accounts with those Originals, for his Justification upon all Occasions. Nor do we need to trust his bare Affirmations and Protestations, but have abundant Evidence from his entire Works, that he really did all along regard, not the Honour or Reputation of his Nation, or of the great Men of it, but the real Truth of Facts; whether they were to their Honour or Dishonour. Of which the Reader will meet with innume-

rable Instances, every where in his Writings. One Example I shall give, because it is so exactly to the present Case, and it is that of the later Idolatry of the Ten Tribes with the two Golden Calves at *Dan* and *Betbel*. Which he is so far from omitting, that he does not so much as attempt to disguise it, but plainly sets it down in its proper Place, and always owns that the Captivity of those ten Tribes was the Punishment of that Idolatry. All which notwithstanding, and notwithstanding the great Reputation he has ever obtained among the best Judges for his Fidelity and Integrity; this Omission is universally ascribed to him; and laid against him; and that sometimes with the highest Aggravations. *But all this without any real Evidence at all.* 'Tis plain that his Copy was taken out of the Temple, and was not a little different from our other Copies. 'Tis pretty plain also, as I have proved, that he used *Nebemiab's* own Copy or Library. And what Parts were wanting in that Copy we have no other way to know at present but by *Josephus* himself. So that this Accusation is entirely a *Supposition without Proof*. Those indeed who have suffered themselves to be imposed upon by the later *Jewish* Rabbins, and have been by them made to believe that the original Copies of the sacred Books of the *Old Testament* were the very same with those we have had from them since the Days of *Barchocab*, may charge this and many other Omissions and Additions and Corrections upon *Josephus*, as their Author; and may blame him for corrupting the sacred Text in these Cases. But those who will have the Patience that I have had, in comparing the ancient *Samaritan*, *Septuagint* and *Masorete* Copies, with that of *Josephus* all along; and will therein use the same impartial

Saga-

Sagacity which they would think proper in comparing the Copies of other ancient Authors ; will see a very different State of Things before them. They will particularly admire and adore the good Providence of God, in preserving, not only the oldest and most authentick Version of the *Septuagint* Interpreters, in a considerable Degree of Purity ; but chiefly the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, and the eleven first Books of *Josephus's* Antiquities : And this last as a faithful Extract out of *Nehemiah's* Library, collected about 270 Years earlier than the *Septuagint* Version was made, and above 600 Years earlier than *Barchocab*, the *Jews* spurious *Messiah* was set up : From which Time I date our present *Masorete* Copy. Any sober Enquirer, who compares all these Copies, will soon discover such Varieties in them, and gain such great Light by the Comparison of those Varieties, as will greatly Surprise, and, if I be not much mistaken, will greatly please him also. Thus he will soon find, on such a Comparison, that the heinous Sins of *David*, as to his Adultery and Murder ; as well as his Punishments for them : As also the heinous Sins of his Son *Solomon*, in his Polygamy and Idolatry, are entirely omitted in our Books of *Chronicles*. *He will also soon find, that most of the glorious Things done by *Jehosaphat*, and God's miraculous Delivery of him and his People in the sudden and dangerous Invasion by the *Moabites*, *Ammonites*, and the Inhabitants of Mount *Seir*. As also the famous Repentance and Restoration of *Manasseh*, are entirely omitted in our Books of *Kings* : To give no more Examples at present : Though they be all preserv'd in other Books of our Bible, and are all thence faithfully described in *Josephus's* Antiquities. But the Examples of
this

this kind are too many to be here set down: So many indeed, that I am satisfied this Omission in *Josephus* is no sufficient Evidence of his Want of Integrity; but rather an Evidence of a great Degree of it, in following his Temple Copy, even where it so greatly differed from all the other Copies; and where it might expose him to the Censure of his Countreymen for an Omission of a very famous History, always own'd for true and genuine by that Nation. It may well enough be supposed, that *Nebemiab's* Copy might deliver this Account nearly as it is in *Josephus*. I mean that *Moses* came down the first Time from Mount Sinai or Horeb, with two large Tables of the Laws of Righteousness contain'd *Exod. xxi. xxii. xxiii.* like those two great Stones in the Samaritan Text, Chap. xx. 17. for the very same Purpose afterwards: And with the Description of the Tabernacle contain'd *Exod. xxv.—xxx.* and that the People had not then offended, and did then receive *Moses* with great Joy and a ready Obedience to those Laws: As *Josephus* assures us they did. Although when he went a second Time to receive the Two small Tables of the Covenant, containing the Ten Words, they made the Golden Calf; as we find in all our other Copies. Those Jews seem to have had a Notion of some such Thing who supposed *Moses* to have been three distinct Times in the Mount, for 40 Days [See Bishop Patrick on *Deut. ix. 25.*] And if we consider the Words of our ordinary Copies, *Exod. xxiv. 12. I will give thee [Moses] Tables of Stones: The Law and the Commandments which I have written:* And compare the Language of Scripture, still distinguishing the Covenant, and the Ten Words delivered solemnly by God himself at Mount Sinai, from these other Laws and Commandments

ments delivered by *Moses*; as I have long ago observed; we shall not perhaps be averse to such an Interpretation. See *Prim. Christ. Reviv'd*, Vol. III. pag. 56, 57. However, I must not here conceal a remarkable Fragment produced from the *Greek Catenæ* by *Vossius* ² out of *Josephus*, which seems to belong to this very Matter, and to be an Intimation that this Idolatry by the Golden Calf was not of old omitted in all the Copies of *Josephus*. The Words are these, *He [Moses] concluded that it was absurd for the People, when they were Drunk, and in their Transgression, to receive the Legislation of God: which Passage highly deserves the Reflexion of the learned upon this Occasion. But the Reader will judge better of such Matters after he has considered of my next Observation.*

N. B. It will be fit to Observe here, the several Occasions, Steps, and Methods by which the sacred Books of the *Old Testament* have come down to us in their present Form, and in so imperfect and disordered a Manner, as we now find them. We all know there have been many Distresses, Idolatries, Persecutions, and Captivities, which the *Israelites* fell into after the Days of *Moses*, and before the Days of *Christ*. Under which not only some of their old Books have been entirely lost; a Catalogue of which *Mr. Du Pin* has given us²; but many of the rest have either lost some Parts, or had those Parts greatly disordered and dislocated by Collectors and Compilers, when they put them together afterward. The first of the Moderns who seems to have been thoroughly sensible of these Disorders and Dislocations,

² De 70 Inter. Apud Ittig. Prolegom. ² Bibliotheca: Prelim. Differt. pag. 30. See also 3 Kings viii. 53. ap. lxxii.

I speak it on my own personal Knowledge, was the most learned Bishop *Lloyd*; though he very rarely let the Publick into that his Discovery. Possibly his *interlined Bible*, that great Treasure of sacred Learning, if once decyphered, would afford us many excellent Observations of this Kind. In the mean Time, take this small Sketch of my own Observations on this Subject. To omit then the Observation, that after nine Chapters of the Book of *Proverbs* are over, the tenth begins like a new Collection of them; the *Proverbs of Solomon*; we find in the first Place a Collection, or rather an Improvement of an ancients Collection of the sacred Books, in the Days of *Hezekiah* King of *Judah*; about 710 Years before the *Christian Æra*: When the xxv. xxvi. xxvii. xxviii and xxix Chapters were added to the Book of *Proverbs*. Which Chapters begin thus: *These are also Proverbs of Solomon, which the Men of Hezekiah, King of Judah copied out.* And perhaps the two last Chapters ascrib'd, the former to *Agur, the Son of Jakeb*; and the latter to *King Lemuel* [or to *Solomon* himself,] might be added not long afterwards. I interpret *King Lemuel* of *King Solomon*; because we meet with no King whose proper Name was *Lemuel*: And because the last Part of the Chapter ascribed to him, is quoted in the ^b Apostolical Constitutions as *Solomon's*. Though I confess the Subject of these Verses is so different from the rest of the foregoing Chapter; and its Manner of Handling so different also; that it may pass for a distinct Chapter: And may possibly belong to a distinct Author. Thus after the long, and, for the greatest Part, most wicked and idolatrous Reign of *Manasseh*, and

^b Constitut. i. 8.

the short, but alike wicked and idolatrous Reign of his Son *Amon*, there was found by *Hilkiab*, the High Priest, upon repairing the Temple in the Days of *Josiah*^c, the original Copy of the *Book of the Law*, or of the principal Laws of *Moses*: And that as *Josephus* informs us, not ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, in the Buildings about the Courts of the Temple only, in which he supposes the entire Collection of sacred Books to have been placed; but particularly ἐν τῷ ναῷ in the *Holy House* itself; the proper Place for that small most sacred *Book of the Laws of Righteousness*: And, as I suppose, written by *Moses's* own Hand. Of the Contents of which Book see *Horeb Covenant Reviv'd*, pag. 107, 108. Upon this Discovery it was, probably, that those principal Laws of *Moses* came to be inserted into the *Pentateuch*; where we now find them. This I may call the *second* Collection, or rather an Improvement of such Collection, which we meet with any Intimation of in ancient Records. Next to this we may reckon *Nebemiah's*, as a *third* Collection: Of which largely already. Only upon its particular Nomination of the *Acts* or Works of *David*, as distinct from the *Acts* or Works of the *Kings*, and of the *Prophets*, it may not improbably be supposed, that the present Collection of *David's Psalms* into five Books, or Parts, was now made: Tho' *Josephus* never mentioning this five fold Division, as belonging to his Copy, I cannot be at all positive about it. This Collection of the Holy Books by *Nebemiah* is justly called a *Library*^d; and is, I think, one of the earliest Examples

^c 2 Kings xxii. 8, &c. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14, &c.
 Esth. ii. 23. ap. lxxii.

^d See

of such a Collection under that Name of a *Library* in all Antiquity. This original Collection of the Holy Books of the *Old Testament*, this *Biblia*, or *Bible*, appears to have been met with by *Josephus*, upon the sacking and burning of *Herod's Temple* by *Titus Vespasian*: When it was given him by *Titus*; but had perhaps lain concealed many Years in that Temple: As had the forementioned original *Book of the Law* lain probably long concealed till the Days of *Josiah*, in *Solomon's Temple*. And had not this last Temple been sack'd and burnt by *Titus*, when *Josephus* was there; and the former been repaired by *Josiah*, when *Hilkiah* was there; 'tis possible to be supposed that neither of these inestimable Treasures had been recovered by us.

Thus the Prophet *Esdra*^s, not long after the Days of *Nehemiah*, added, in the *fourth Place*, the *Prophecy of Malachi* to the ancients sacred Catalogue: And thereby compleated the *Hebrew Canon of Jerusalem*: At least if we include the Prophet *Esdra*'s own Book or Books. Of which see the Appendix to the fourth Volume of *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, and the Authentick Records, pag. 46—161.

Thus there was in the *fifth Place*, about a Century later, an Addition made to the *Book of Esdras* the Scribe; though now inserted into the Book of *Nehemiah*; reaching as low as the Days of *Jaddua* the High Priest, in or near the Days of *Alexander the Great*, already intimated. This was probably done by those who made that Collection which the *Septuagint Interpreters* followed, in the Days of *Ptolemy Lagi*, and *Ptolemy Philadelphus*; in which Edi-

tion we find that Insertion. About, or perhaps before this Time, it seems to me, in the *sixth* Place, the *Samaritan Pentateuch* obtained its present Form; as being much of Kin to, and greatly supported by the *Septuagint Greek* Copy of that *Pentateuch*, though it be a more full, and a much better Copy than the other. Whether it came to the first *Christians* from the *Samaritans* themselves, or from the proper *Jews*, I cannot certainly say, for want of Historical Memoirs concerning it. Though its reaching no farther than the *Pentateuch*, looks more like a Derivation from the *Samaritans*, who owned no more than that *Pentateuch*; than from the proper *Jews*, who owned all the other Books. The Reason of the Difficulty is this; that, as I have elsewhere proved, not the *Samaritan Bible* only, but the *Jewish* also, was all written in no other than the *Samaritan* Character, till the Days of *Barchocab*. See Essay on the *Old Testament*, pag. 149—171. But then, in the *seventh* Place, the most entire Collection of the sacred Books of the *Jews*, preserved in any Language, which may be called the *Hellenistical*, as the former the *Hebrew Canon*; seems to have been reserved for *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, and for the enriching of his famous *Alexandrian Library*. The remains of which *Hellenistical Canon* we have chiefly in the *Synopsis sacræ scripturæ*, and in the *Septuagint Bible*; including now some Books written a little after that Version was made. Which *Hellenistical Canon* is attested to by the known Books of the *New Testament*; by the Apostolical Constitutions; and by all the other Apostolical and most Primitive Christian Writers; who always quote the Books of the *Old Testament* according to that Version. Thus we
know,

know, in the *eighth* Place, that † *Judas Macca-*
bæus made a Collection of the Holy Books at
Jerusalem, after the Persecution by *Antiochus*
Epiphanes, which seems to have been the last
 publick *Hebrew* Collection that was made:
 Till in the *ninth* and last Place, the *Jews* fixed
 upon us their later Collection or Edition (called
 by me the *Masorete* Copy,) when they set up
 their spurious *Messiah Barchocab*, in the former
 Part of the second Century of *Christianity*. Of
 whose Imperfections I have largely treated in
 my *Essay on the Old Testament*.

N. B. The Result of my long and laborious En-
 quiries about the genuine Copies, Editions,
 and Readings of the sacred Books of the *Old*
Testament is plainly this; that although the
 modern *Jews*, and almost all the modern *Chri-*
stians, who, by an unhappy Fatality, have
 been deluded by them, are very positive for
 a Kind of *Perfection*, in our *Masorete Hebrew*
 Copy; and it has been a long while accord-
 ingly styled, *The Hebrew Verity*; yet is the
 Truth of the Case for certain far otherwise:
 That, on the contrary, those Books have
 come down to us in a very imperfect and
 disordered Condition, even in all our Copies:
That even Nehemiah's own Copy, as given us
 by *Josephus*, though by far the oldest and
 best of them all, was by no means perfect;
 I mean this as to the oldest Books: Though,
 without Doubt, the latest were much more
 perfect and uncorrupt: Especially those that
 were written under or after the *Babylonian*
 Captivity: I mean *Daniel*, *Haggai*, *Zachariah*,
*Esdra*s, *Nehemiah* and *Esther*: That the Copy
 which we call the *Samaritan*, being that which
 has alone preserv'd the original *Hebrew*
 Character, ever used by the *Jews* till the

Days of *Barchocab*^f, has been preserv'd in the next Degree of Perfection, and, had it not been confined to the *Pentateuch* alone, would have been a Treasure still more inestimable: *That* the Copy used by the *Septuagint* Interpreters, was still more imperfect: *That* *Judas Maccabæus's* Copy or Collection, being not now extant, we cannot tell what Perfection it had; only so far, that it contained some ancient Histories or sacred Books which none of the remaining Copies have preserved to us: 2 *Maccab.* i. ii. *That*, for certain, the present *Masorete* Copy is the most imperfect and corrupt of them all. But *that* still, upon the View of the whole, any judicious and impartial Enquirer will not only be satisfied of the general Nature of the Laws, the general Truth of the Histories, the general Purport of the Prophecies, and the general Wisdom of the moral Instructions all along: (The very worst Copy no way appearing to have been altered so much as *one tenth*, perhaps not *one twentieth* of the whole:) But will commonly be able, upon the Comparison of them all together, and of the ancient Citations made from them in different Ages, to distinguish the true genuine Readings, and the true genuine Order from the Mistakes and Disorders of our present Copies: Nay *that* he will soon discover, that almost all our present Difficulties and seeming Contradictions in those sacred Books, as compared together, had no Place in the original Writings themselves; but have still arisen sometimes from the bare Mistakes of modern Rabbins and Commentators; but much

^f See *Essay on the Old Testament*, pag. 149 — 164.

oftener from the Mistakes of our modern Copies and Versions. Nor does it appear to me, that *Josephus*, in his Use of the Temple or *Nebemiah's* Copy, was ever sensible of more than one Text in that Copy which so much as *seemingly contradicted* any other. I mean *Gen. xv. 13.* ^s as compared with *Exod. xii. 40, 41.* How numerous and difficult soever those *seeming Contradictions* do now appear in our present Copies; and are noted by every Commentator at this Day: which Thing highly deserves the most serious Consideration.

N. B. If we could suppose that *Josephus* meant all the 22 Volumes of the *Jews Hebrew Bible*, by that *Law of the Jews* which he assures us was ^a carried in Triumph at Rome by *Titus*, we might suppose that the Box, or somewhat like it, now supporting the Candlestick upon *Titus's* Triumphal Arch ¹, either was or included the very Receptacle of those 22 Volumes; and that this Receptacle was the very Book-Case of *Nebemiah's Library*, then taken out of the *Jewish Temple*. However, since *Josephus* rather means the *Pentateuch* by the *Law of the Jews* on other Occasions; and since he assures us ^k, that he himself lived in *Vespasian's* own House, which he had before he was Emperor, and by Consequence there used the Temple Copy of the sacred Books given him by *Titus*, 'tis not impossible that Library of *Nebemiah* may be still remaining among the Ruins of Rome; though I doubt, if it should be dug up, and known, the Letters must long ago, by length

^s Antiq. i. 10. 3. and ii. 9. 2. with ii. 15. 2.

vii. 5. 5. ⁱ Vid. Reland. de Spoliis Templi pag. 6.

Vitã suã § 76.

^h De Bell.

^k De

of Time, have become illegible: We having no Manuscript, now remaining legible, so old as *Josephus*, much less so old as *Nebemiah*. Otherwise, if such Book-Case, with its Library, were once discovered, and the Letters were legible, I venture to say, that it would deserve to be esteemed a much greater Treasure than all the other Treasures of Antiquity in that famous City put together.

N. B. Since it appears to me very evident, that when *Josephus* wrote his *Antiquities*, and therein gave us the remarkable Testimonies already recited concerning *John the Baptist*, *Jesus Christ*, and his Brother *James the Just*, he was, in his own Conscience, a Nazarene or Ebionite Christian; it may not be amiss to enquire at what Time of his Life and Writings he became such. Now this Time must, I think, be determined to be after the finishing of his seven Books of the *Jewish Wars*, about A. D. 75. but long before his finishing his twenty Books of the *Jewish Antiquities*, A. D. 93. My Reasons are these:

- (1) That though all the Facts which concerned *Monobazus* or *Abgarus* and *Helena*, and their Conversion to *Josephus's* Judaism, i. e. to Nazarene or Ebionite Christianity, produced in the Authentick Records, p. 954—961. and all that concerned *John the Baptist*, *Jesus Christ*, and *James* his Brother, already produced in these Papers, were within the Compass of the seven Books of the *Wars of the Jews*; yet have we not a Word of any of them there; but only in the *Antiquities*. Which looks very like such a Concern for Christianity when he wrote the *Jewish Antiquities*, as he had not when he wrote the *Jewish Wars*. Nor do I remember the least Passage in those Books of the *Wars* rela-

ting at all to *Christianity*. Which Silence *Pho-
tius* observes, as we have noted already, p. 66
prius, to have been usual when unbelieving
Jews wrote any Histories of that Age.

- (2) The great Progress the Gospel had made af-
ter *Josephus* had written his Books of the *Jew-
ish Wars*, and long before he finished his Books
of Antiquities, and this particularly as to the
Greeks and *Romans*, among whom he then lived,
might very naturally excite in him a great
Curiosity to make an exact Enquiry into it,
and into the Miracles that supported it. The
Effect of which would naturally be his Con-
viction of their Truth, and his Conversion to
Christianity.
- (3) The great Disappointments *Josephus* had met
with in the Deaths of *Vespasian* and his Son
Titus, to both whom he had foretold their com-
ing to the *Roman Empire*, and from both whom
he must naturally have had great Expectations
to the Advantage of his People the *Jews*,
together with the continued deplorable Estate
that People were under ever since the Destru-
ction of *Jerusalem*, must naturally make him
cast his Eyes elsewhere. And since any Deli-
verance from the *Romans* could now be only
hoped for from the *Jews Messiah*, *Josephus's*
Circumstances and Notions directly led him to
consider whether that *Messias* was not already
come, and so directly prepared him for the
Examination and Belief of *Christianity*. Which
therefore most probably commenced soon af-
ter the Death of *Vespasian*, A. D. 79. or how-
ever of *Titus*, A. D. 81.
- (4) The Nature of his Books of *Antiquities*, which
frequently brought before him the Scripture
Prophecies, and particularly those that gave
Characters of the *Jews Messiah*, would natural-
ly make him inquisitive into their Completion.

The

The Effect of which would also naturally be his Conviction that *Jesus* was to be acknowledged by those Characters to be the true *Messias*. Which Effect those Prophecies frequently had in that Age in other *Jews* Conversion to *Christianity* also. But especially

- (5) The Nature of those his Books of *Antiquities* brought before him the *Prophecies of Daniel*, concerning the *four Monarchies*; and concerning the *Messias's Fifth Monarchy* or Kingdom to succeed them; concerning the Death of the *Messiah*, after 70 Weeks of Years from the Days of *Nebemiah*; concerning the Destruction of *Jerusalem* by the fourth or *Roman Monarchy*, which Destruction he saw; and concerning the *Messias's* future Overthrow of that Monarchy, all which Predictions he seems to me to have rightly and christianly applied. So that he could not well avoid seeing, that by *Daniel's* Prophecies, *Jesus* of *Nazareth* was that *Messias*. And very remarkable it is, that the Prophecies in this Book of *Daniel*, which have the strongest and clearest Proofs for the *Jewish* and *Christian* Religion of all others, appear to have affected *Josephus* far more than any or all the other Prophecies. His Accounts of these alone being in those his *Antiquities* far larger than the like Accounts therein of all the other Scripture Prophecies put together. Nor can I do other than suspect that it was his through Consideration of these Prophecies of *Daniel*, when in the Course of his Narration he came naturally to treat of them, and with which he appears so greatly affected, that principally contributed to his Conversion to *Christianity*. Nor are we to forget that *Josephus* seems ever, in his *Wars of the Jews*, to apply *Daniel's* Prediction of *Time, Times and a Half*, Dan. vii. 25. and

xii. 7. to the Prophanation by *Antiochus*, as if it had lasted *three Years and a Half*, *De Bell. Proem. 7. L. I. 1. 1. V. 9. 4.* while he does as often leave off that Application in his *Antiquities*, x. 11. 7. xii. 7. 6. *bis.* and honestly own, with the original Authors of the two Books of the *Maccabees*, that such Prophanation continued but *three Years only*: Which last is also, I think, a remarkable Application of one of *Daniel's* Prophecies, I mean that of the 1100 Evenings and 1100 Mornings, 2200 in all, *Dan. viii. 14.* which seems to have been the Number in *Josephus's* Copy, as *Jerom* says some would have it in his Time; instead of those 2300 in our *Masorete Hebrew*, in *Clem. Alex. in Africanus*, in the MS. *Alex.* and those 2400 in our *Vatican* Copy. So that, upon the whole, it is most probable, that when *Josephus* wrote his seven Books of the *Jewish Wars*, about *A. D. 75.* he was an unbelieving *Jew*; but that when he was writing the tenth Book of his *Antiquities*, about *A. D. 84.* he became a *Christian*. Nor is there, I think, any more Indication in the former *nine* Books of *Antiquities* that he was so at that Time, than in the *seven* Books of the *Jewish Wars*: Though afterward we have frequent Indications of it in the *eleven* following Books of his *Antiquities*.

APPENDIX I.

*Containing a Reply to Dr. SYKES'S
Defence of his Dissertation concerning
the Eclipse mentioned by PHLEGON.*

SINCE I published my *Vindication of the Testimony of Phlegon*, as relating to the *supernatural* Darkness and Earthquake at our Saviour's Passion, the Publick has been made acquainted with three distinct accurate Calculations, from the best Astronomical Tables^k, or the Result of such Calculations, by a nameless Author, by Mr. *Hodgson*, and by Dr. *Halley*, of a *natural Eclipse*, supposed by *Kepler* to be that meant by *Phlegon*: As well as it had before been made acquainted, though without my Consent or Privity^l, of an inaccurate *Calculation*, or rather *Approximation* of mine, by an Instrument called by me the *Copernicus*. This I reckon does rarely err much above an Hour in the Time of the middle of the general Eclipse, and but proportionably in other Circumstances: As indeed it did scarcely err more than an Hour and twenty Minutes from Dr. *Halley's* Calculation in the present Eclipse. This is to me a very ready, and a very useful Instrument upon many such Occasions: I mean where a greater Nicety is not necessary; which I took to be the Case as to that Eclipse of *Kepler's*. However, I am very glad that we have

^k Dr. Sykes's *Defence*, pag. 62, 63, 64.
Dissertation, p. 75.

^l Dr. Sykes's *Dis-*

the before-mentioned three *exact Calculations* of it, or the Result of them now before us. The first of which was sent to me in a Letter, about *September* last, by an unknown Person; who styled himself *G. M.* and who, I now find, was the Author of the Calculation lately published. The Letter was neither dated, nor contained any Intimation whither I might direct an Answer. So it has remained unanswered till this Time: When I find the same Calculation in print. The Reader will therefore now give me leave to publish the rest of those inaccurate *Calculations* or *Approximations*, made by that *Copernicus*, which relate to the Eclipse of *Pblegon*: And which were many of them made before the other: And indeed at a Time when I did not in the least suspect that any one had supposed an Eclipse in the *first* Year of the 202^d Olympiad, could possibly be that described by *Pblegon* as in its *fourth* Year. However, because there then seemed to be some Evidence for the *second* Year of that Olympiad, I then calculated for both the 2^d and 4th Years; and have since done the same for the rest of the *four* Years of that 202^d Olympiad: As also for the preceding and subsequent Years. I shall therefore transcribe what *Calculations* or *Approximations* have for some time lain by me; together with those parallel ones made since: which in my *Vindication* I thought not necessary; because the Evidence for any other Year but the *fourth*, upon a careful Examination, I found, was come to just nothing; and because no Astronomer ever pretended to have found any Eclipse to suit *Pblegon's* Character in that *fourth* Year.

Let us therefore calculate the several natural Eclipses of the Sun for all the *four* Years of the 202^d, for the *fourth* Year of the 201st, and for the *first* of the 203^d Olympiad, *i. e.* for the 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th Years of the Reign of the Emperor *Tiberius*. And let us see, whether any of them

them will agree to *Pblegon's* Description or not. Take the *Calculations* or *Approximations* in Brief for the Meridian of *Nice* in *Bitbunia*; the only Place named in *Pblegon's* Description, as follows; all fitted to the mean Time.

N. B. The two Conjunctions in the Beginning of *December* and *January*, A. D. 28 and $2\frac{8}{9}$, hardly afford any Eclipses at all; even about the two Poles: So I do not set down their Calculations.

(1) ☉ Eclipsed *May*, A. D. 29.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉	Gem.	6	45
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☾	Gem.	1	45
+	8	11	11	22	5		diff.	5	0
+ June		1	10	48	11	Mean	Time	d	h
		11	29	55	11	June		0	0
Rest.				4	49				31
d	0					=	May 30	23	39
b	0					+ diff. Merid.	2	10	
'	10					=	June 0	1	49
						i. e.	1 ^h 49'	after 12	
							on	May 31,	in
							common reckon-		
							ing.		
						+ Equat	10	30	
						=	May 31 st	12	19
						☾ Lat. South	63'		
						Node Ascend.			
						Annular.			

N. B. The *Southern* Latitude of the Moon is here so great, and the Time so near Midnight, that on both Accounts this Eclipse could not possibly be visible either at *Rome*, *Nice*, or *Jerusalem*.

(136)

(2) ☉ Eclipsed November, A. D. 29.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Sagit.	1	0
+ Years	20	4	13	25	13	☾ Sagit.	5	40
+	8	11	11	22	5	diff.	4	40
+ Nov.		3	15	59	16	Mean		
		2	4	56	16	Time	24	4 53 30
						Nov.	—	31
Rest.		9	25	3	44	=	24	4 22 30
d 24		9	22	34	40	diff. Merid.		
						Greenwich	2	10 0
b 4		2	29	4		and Nice		
						=	24	6 32 30
53		2	1	54		— Eq.	8	40
						=	23	21 52 30
" 30		27	10			= Middle of the		
		26	55			general Eclipse.		
		15				Lat. North	43'	
						Just Total.		
						Node Descend.		

N. B. Of this Eclipse see more afterward.

(3) ☉ Eclipsed May, A. D. 30.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Taur.	26	25
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☾ Taur.	24	10
+	9	3	20	59	30	diff.	2	15
May			22	53	23	Mean		
		3	21	27	48	Time	20	9 18
						May		
Rest.		8	8	32	12	=	20	8 47
d 20		8	3	48	53	+		2 10
			4	43	19	=	20	10 57
b 9			4	34	18	+		5 0
18			9	1		=	20	15 57
						Lat. South	21'	
						Node Ascend.		
						Annular.		

N. B.

(137)

N. B. This Eclipse was not Total any where:
It was of *South* Latitude, and before Sun-rising:
and so entirely invisible at *Rome, Nice, and*
Jerusalem.

(4) ☉ Eclipsed *November, A. D. 30.*

A. D. 1	6	24	9	42	☉ Scorp.	20	30
Years 20	4	13	25	13	☾ Scorp.	20	45
+	9	3	20	59	diff.	0	15
Nov.	3	15	59	16	Mean		
					Time	a	b
					Nov.	13	13
	6	14	33	41			42
Rest.	5	15	26	19			31
d 13	5	8	28	47	=	13	13
		6	57	32	+		2
b 13		6	36	12	=	13	15
' 42			21	20	=	13	14
							56
					☾ Lat.	0	0
					Node Descend.		
					Total for a very few		
					Minutes.		

N. B. This Eclipse was Total ; but still earlier
before Sun-rising than the former: And so en-
tirely invisible at *Rome, Nice, and Jerusalem.*

T

(5) ☉ Eclipsed

(138)

(5) ☉ Eclipsed May, A. D. 31.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Taur.	16	40
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☾ Taur.	17	40
+	10	8	0	36	53	diff.	1	0
May			22	53	23	Mean		
		8	1	5	11	Time	9	18
						May		6
Reft.		3	28	54	49	=	9	17
d	9	3	19	43	0	+		2
			9	11	49	=	9	19
b	18		9	8	35	—		1
'	6			3	14	=	9	18
						☾ Lat. North.		3
						Nod Ascend.		
						Annular for some Mi-		
						minutes.		

N. B. This Eclipse was by no Means Total any where: And was about or before Sun-rising at Rome, Nice, and Jerusalem.

(6) ☉ Eclipsed November, A. D. 31.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Scorp.	8	50
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☾ Scorp.	6	30
+	10	8	0	36	53	diff.	2	20
+ Nov.		3	15	59	16	Mean		
		10	24	11	4	Time	2	22
						Nov.		30
Reft		1	5	48	56	=	2	21
d	2		24	22	53	+		2
			11	26	3	=	3	0
b	22		11	10	30	+		4
'	30			15	33	=	3	4
						☾s Lat. South.		38
						Node Descend.		
						Total.		

N. B.

(139)

N. B. This Eclipse was indeed Total, but only in the *Southern* Parts, beyond the Latitude of the Cape of *Good Hope*. Neither could it be at all visible at *Rome*, *Nice*, or *Jerusalem*.

(7) ☉ Eclipsed *April*, A. D. 32.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Taur.	6	15
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☽ Taur.	11	15
+	11		10	14	17	diff.	5	0
+ Apr.			17	10	2	Mean		
						Time	28	2 55
						April		
								31
Rest	11	25	0	46		=	28	2 24
d 29 (28)	11	23	31	53		+		2 10
		1	28	53		=	28	4 34
b 2		1	0	57		—	11	0
55			27	56		=	27	17 34
					☽ Lat. South			34'
					Node Ascend.			
					Annular.			

N. B. This Eclipse was not Total any where: It was about Sun-rising; and not at all considerable but in the *Southern* Parts, near the Latitude of the Cape of *Good Hope*: And was not at all visible either at *Rome*, *Nice*, or *Jerusalem*.

(140)

(8) ☉ Eclipsed September, A. D. 32.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Virg.	29	30
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☽ Virg.	27	12
+	11		10	14	17	diff.	2	18
+	Sept.	2	22	21	7	Mean		
		2	10	10	19	Time	22	18
						Sept.		35
Reft						=	22	18
d 23 (22)		9	19	49	41	+		2
		9	10	23	13	=	22	20
b 18			9	26	28	+		4
			9	8	35	=	23	0
35				17	53	☽ Lat. North		86
						Node Descend.		
						Annular.		

N. B. This Eclipse was not Total any where:
Nor at all considerable but near the North Pole.

(9) ☉ Eclipsed October, A. D. 32.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Libra	28	0
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☽ Libra	24	7
+	11		10	14	17	diff.	3	53
+	Octob.	2	28	4	28	Mean		
		2	15	53	40	Time	22	7
						Octob.		19
Reft		9	14	6	20	=	22	6
d 23 (22)		9	10	23	13	+		2
			3	43	7	=	22	8
b 7			3	33	20	+		7
19				9	47	=	22	16
						☽ Lat. South.		80
						Node Descend.		
						Annular.		

N. B. This

N. B. This Eclipse was not Total any where: It was in the Night Time as to *Rome, Nice, and Jerusalem.* Nor was it at all considerable but near the *South Pole.*

(10) ☉ Eclipsed *March, A. D. 33.*

<i>A. D.</i>	1	6	24	9	42	☉ <i>Pisc.</i>	26	45
<i>Years</i>	20	4	13	25	13	☾ <i>Pisc.</i>	26	45
+	12	5	2	3	7	<i>diff.</i>	0	0
+ <i>March</i>		11	29	15	14	<i>Mean</i>	18	22
		4	8	53	16	<i>Time</i>		
						<i>March</i>		
<i>Rest</i>		7	21	6	44	=	18	22
<i>d</i>	18	7	9	26	00	+	2	10
			11	40	44	=	19	0
<i>b</i>	22		11	10	30	☾ <i>Lat. South</i>		39'
				30	14	<i>Node Ascend.</i>		
	59			29	58	<i>Total for several Mi-</i>		
				16		<i>nutes.</i>		

N. B. This great Total Eclipse was not considerable any where, but about the Cape of *Good Hope.* Nor could it be at all visible at *Rome, Nice, or Jerusalem.*

N. B. At the next full Moon to this last Eclipse of the Sun, there was a considerable Eclipse of the Moon, April 3, the very Day that *Jesus of Nazareth* was crucified. Which Eclipse has been exactly calculated by *Bullialdus*; and the Result of that Calculation given us by *Monsieur Toinard* in his *Harmony*, p. 148, 149. However, take my own *Approximation*, as usual; but for the *Meridian of Jerusalem.*

A. D.

(142)

☾ Eclipsed April A. D. 33.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Aries	10	45
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☾ Libra	5	45
+	12	5	2	3	7	diff.	5	0
+ April			17	10	2	Mean		
		4	26	48	4	Time	2	17
						April		21
Rest	1	3	11	56				31
d	2		24	22	53	=	2	16
			8	49	3	+		2
b	17		8	38	6	=	2	19
				10	57	+		10
				10	40	=	3	6
21				17		☾ Lat. South		36'
						Node Descend.		
						Digits Eclipsed		9

N. B. The Moon rose at *Jerusalem* just upon Sun-
 setting of a red Hue, in a *natural* Eclipse of
 six or seven Digits: Which was the very same
 Day on which we had the *super-natural* Eclipse
 of the Sun. So that, in the sacred Language,* *The*
Sun was turned into Darknefs, and the Moon into
Blood, on the Day of our Saviour's Death; 37 $\frac{1}{2}$
Years before the great and terrible Day of the
Lord, the Destruction of Jerusalem, came.

* Joel ii. 31.

(143)

(11) ☉ Eclipsed September, A. D. 33.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Virg.	17	30
Years	20	4	13	23	13	☾ Virg.	20	40
+	12	5	2	3	7	diff.	3	10
+ Sept.		2	22	21	7	Mean		
		7	1	59	9	Time	12	3 24
						Sept.		
Rest		4	28	0	51	=	12	2 31
d 12		4	26	17	20	+		2 53
			1	43	31	=	12	5 10
b 3			1	31	26	-		5 3
' 24				12	5	=	11	7 3
						=	11	22 0
						☾s Lat. North		25'
						Node Descend.		
						Annular for several		
						Minutes.		

N. B. This Eclipse was by no Means total any where: Its Middle was between eight and nine a Clock in the Morning at Rome; between nine and ten at Nice; and about ten at Jerusalem.

(12) ☉ Eclipsed March, A. D. 34.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Pisc.	15	30
Years	20	4	13	25	13	☾ Pisc.	11	0
+	13	9	11	40	32	diff.	4	30
+ March		11	29	15	14	Mean		
		8	18	30	41	Time	8	7 49
						March		
Rest		3	11	29	19	=	8	7 31
d 8		3	7	31	33	+		2 18
			3	57	46	=	8	9 10
b 7			3	33	20	+		9 28
' 49				24	26	=	8	8 20
						=	8	17 48
						☾s Lat. South		4'
						Node Ascend.		
						Total for several Mi-		
						nutes.		N. B.

N. B. This was a great total Eclipse: But a long Way South of *Rome*, *Nice*, and *Jerusalem*. Its Middle also was before Sun-rising there, and so was invifible at all thofe Places.

N. B. The Reason why I felect *Rome* to be diftinctly confidered is, becaufe *Pblegon* lived there with *Adrian* the Emperor, his Patron, and it was the Capital of the Empire. The Reason why I felect *Nice* in *Bithynia* for the Meridian to which I calculate, is becaufe it is the only Place exprefly mentioned in *Pblegon's* Testimony, as one where the great Earthquake was very remarkable and fatal. And the Reason why I felect *Jerusalem*, is becaufe there was the principal Place of the Darknefs and Earthquake at our Saviour's Paffion; although *Pblegon* furely could have no Regard to *Jerusalem*, unlefs he had a Regard to the Eclipse at *Jerusalem* at our Saviour's Paffion.

N. B. There was no direct Occafion for computing the Eclipses for either the fourth Year of the 201st, or the firft Year of the 203^d Olympiad, *i. e.* for the fifteenth or twentieth Years of *Tiberius*: There being no Evidence, or next to no Evidence for either of thofe Years, in all Antiquity, but only for the 202^d Olympiad. Nor was there any direct Occafion for computing the Eclipses of the third Year of the 202^d Olympiad neither: Which was the eighteenth Year of *Tiberius*: Becaufe there never was the leaft proper Evidence produc'd for that Year: And becaufe the Evidence of the ancient *Chriftian* Testimonies againft it are undeniable. For when their own Notions, whether of *Daniel's* 70 Weeks, or of the Number of Paffovers and Years of our Saviour's Miniftry, greatly difpofed moft of them to wifh, that *Pblegon's* Eclipse and Earthquake had

had been on that third Year; yet did all that quote *Pblegon's* Words agree, that they belonged to the fourth Year only. However to prevent all Manner of Doubt, I have computed for every one of the six Years, without Exception.

N. B. Take here the Words of the great Astronomer *Kirchius*, out of the *Berlin Transactions*, *A. D.* 1723. pag. 139. for a Confirmation of what I have here computed and noted concerning the Eclipses on the second and fourth Years of the 202^d Olympiad, as relating to that described by *Pblegon*. *Pauca adhuc*, says *Kirchius*, *de Eclipsi Pblegontæâ attingam: quam alii ad annum secundum; alii ad annum quartum Olympiadis 202 referunt. Annus secundus initium; A. C. 30 post Solstitium æstivum cæpit & duravit usque ad solstitium æstivum sequentis anni. Hoc temporis intervallo illi ambo defectus solis contigerunt, de quibus hætenus egi; & quos in Sind observarunt. Hæ verd Eclipses nullibi in totâ Europâ, neque etiam in regionibus occidentalioribus Asiæ observari potuerunt, cum ijs locis, tempore harum Eclipsium, sol fuerit sub horizonte. Annus quartus Olympiadis 202. incepit anno Christi 32. post solstitium æstivum, durans ad solstitium sequentis anni. Anno Christi 32. mensibus Septembri & Octobri, duæ parvæ Eclipses solis circa Polos acciderunt. Et A. C. 33. die 19 vel 20 Mart. notabilis quidem Eclipsis in hemisphærio australi observata est. Ut ita annis 2 & 4 Olympiadis 202. nulla facta sit Eclipsis Solis quæ a Pblegonte notari potuisset: Ne dicam quæ tam magna & notabilis fuerit. Sed peculiarem disquisitionem meretur hæc Eclipsis: Quam quidem sub manibus habeo. Sed cum plures Eclipsium calculi ad eam sint necessarii, plurimum negotii illa mihi facessit; ut eam in aliam occasionem differre cogar.*

N. B. Since on the *fourth* Year of the 224th, or on the *first* Year of the 225th Olympiad, corresponding to Part of the Year of *Christ* 120. to all 121, and to Part of 122, in the very Days of *Phlegon*, there was really an Earthquake at *Nicomedia*, *Nice*, and other Places of *Bitbynia*. [See *Euseb. Chron. cum Scalig. Not.*] It may not be quite improper, in order to prevent all possible Doubt in this Matter, to enquire whether any Eclipse of the Sun in those Years corresponds to this Earthquake, and answers to *Phlegon's* Description. Which Enquiry will soon be satisfied by the following Approximations.

(13) ☉ Eclipsed *July*, *A. D.* 120.

<i>A. D.</i>	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Cancer	18	00
Years 100		10	7	6	5	☽ Cancer	19	05
+	19	11	21	36	21	diff.	1	5
<i>July</i>		1	16	31	33	Mean		
		6	9	23	41	Time } <i>July</i>	12	23 54
								29
Rest		5	20	36	19	= 12	23	25
<i>d</i> 13 (12)		5	8	28	47	+	2	10
			12	7	32	= 13	1	35
<i>b</i> 23			11	40	58	—	2	35
<i>i</i> 54				26	34	= 12	23	0
						☽s Lat.	0	0 0
						Node Ascend.		
						Annular for a very		
						few Minutes.		

N. B. This Eclipse was not total any where, and went a great deal too far *South* of *Rome*, *Nice* and *Jerusalem*, to be near total at any of those Places.

(147)

(14) ☉ Eclipsed January, A. D. 121

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Capric.	14	30
Years 100	10	7	6	5		☽ Capric.	10	20
+	20	4	13	25	13	diff.	4	10
Jan.	0	0	0	0	0	Mean	Time } ^d ^h	
	9	14	41	0		Jan.		
							6	5 18'
								29
Rest	2	15	19	0		= 6	4	49
d 6	2	13	8	40		+	2	10
		2	10	20		= 6	6	59
b 5	+	2	0	57		+	7	30
' 18			9	23		= 6	14	29
						☽ North Lat.	16	
						Node Descend.		
						Total for about	2'	

N. B. This Eclipse was in the Night Time, as to Rome, Nice, and Jerusalem: And so entirely invisible in all those Places.

(15) ☉ Eclipsed July, A. D. 121.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Canc.	8	45
Years 100	10	7	6	5		☽ Canc.	12	50
+	20	4	13	25	13	diff.	4	5
July		3	16	31	33	Mean	Time } ^d ^h	
						July		
	11	1	12	33			2	8 41
								29
Rest		28	47	27		= 2	8	12
d 2		24	22	53		+	2	10
		4	24	34		= 2	10	22
b 8		4	3	49		—	8	10
41			20	45		= 27	2	12
						☽ Lat. North	7'	
						Node Descend.		
						Annular.		

N. B. This Eclipse was not total any where: And happened about Four or Five a Clock in the Afternoon at Rome, Nice and Jerusalem.

(148)

(16) ☉ Eclipsed December, A. D. 121.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Capr.	5	10
Years 100	10	7	6	5		☾ Sagit.	29	30
+	20	4	13	25	13	diff.	5	40
Decemb.	3	21	42	36		Mean		
						Time	26	13
						Dec.		5
								29
Rest	10	23	36	24		=26	12	36
d 26	10	16	57	33		+	2	10
		6	38	51		=26	14	46
b 13	+	6	36	12		+	11	20
5			2	39		=27	2	36
						☾ Lat. South.		36'
						Node Descend.		
						Annular.		

N. B. This Eclipse was not total any where : Nor considerable any where, but beyond the Southern Latitude of the Cape of Good Hope.

(17) ☉ Eclipsed June, A. D. 122.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Gem.	29	15
Years 100	10	7	6	5		☾ Canc.	4	30
+	20	4	13	25	13	diff.	5	15
+	1	4	9	37	25	Mean		
June	1	10	48	11		Time	21	17
						June		29
								29
						=21	17	0
						+	2	10
Rest	8	24	53	24		=21	19	10
d 21	8	16	0	20		—	10	30
		8	53	4		=21	8	40
b 17		8	38	6		☾ Lat. North.		64'
29			14	58		Node Ascend.		
						Annular.		

N. B. This Eclipse was not total any where : It was but small at Rome, Nice, and Jerusalem.

At

At which Places it happened near to or after Sunset also.

“ COROLLARY. None of these natural Eclipses of the Sun therefore, unless the second, of which hereafter, could possibly be that Eclipse described by *Pblegon*. ”

N. B. I have not always been very solicitous for the Exactness of these Approximations; because they are abundantly sufficient for my present Purpose, without such Exactness. Those Astronomers who have a Mind may compute these Eclipses by Numbers, to much greater Nicety: In which Computation this more gross Way of *Approximation* will generally save them near the one Half of their Trouble: As all such Calculators well know.

Having now dispatched all the other Eclipses of the Sun that could possibly be meant by *Pblegon*, and found them all to be entirely out of the Question: Before we come to consider the *second*, which is the only one remaining, let us see how many other Attempts have been made in order to prevent *Pblegon*'s Testimony from belonging to the Eclipse and Earthquake at our Saviour's Passion: And from affording an Attestation to the Truth of the Evangelical History. Of those former Attempts I have met with no fewer than *nine*: And the present Attempt is with me the *tenth*.

(i) The *first* Attempt was that of the Old Heathens, in the first, second and third Centuries: Who all allowed that there was a very great Eclipse of the Sun at the Passion of *Jesus of Nazareth*, but were willing to believe it was no more than a *natural Eclipse*, though very extraordinary in its Kind. Nor did they recede from this Plea till the *Christians* proved to them, beyond Contradiction, that *Jesus of Nazareth* was crucified at the *Jewish Passover*; and that the *Jewish Passover* was always at the *full Moon*: While all natural Eclipses of the Sun,

Sun, as they could not possibly deny, were at the New.

(2) The next Attempt I have met with was that of the ignorant Author or Authors of a great Part of what now stands under the Name of *Origen*, in his *Latin Comment on St. Matthew*,^a Tract. xxxv. set down in my *Vindication of Pblegon* at large, but in the Copy of *Paschasius Rhadbertus*, in the ninth Century, stood rather as written against *Origen*^b; as I have there shewed also. This Author or Authors appears to have known so little of ancient Writers, that he says *No Latins or Greeks had mentioned this Eclipse*: While *Origen* had himself twice quoted *Pblegon*, a Greek Writer's, Testimony for it. This Writer, or Writers, also imagines, that the Darkness was no Eclipse of the Sun; as *Origen* himself and all the ancienter Authors had supposed; but only a *Collection of dark Clouds over Judea, or perhaps over Jerusalem only*.^c I repeat the last Words, and desire they may be remarked, *or perhaps over Jerusalem only*: Either of which he, most absurdly, supposes might alone be meant by *all the Earth*, or by *the whole Earth*, to which the Darkness extended by the Gospel History: Of which more presently.

(3) The next Attempt, I reckon that blind and too grossly absurd Intimation of *Kepler's*^d, that this Darkness might not be an Eclipse of the Sun, nor a Collection of real Clouds, but a *Cloud of Ashes*, sent into *Judæa* from Mount *Ætna* or *Vesuvius*, and obscuring the Sun there.

(4) The next Attempt I esteem that of *Kepler's*^e groundless Emendation of Γ for Δ in *Pblegon's* Testimony: i. e. that this Eclipse happened not on the *fourth*, but on the *third* Year of the Olympiad.

^a pag. 10—15.

Dr. Sykes's Defence, pag. 26.

^e *Dr. Sykes's Dissert.* pag. 70, 71, 72.

^b pag. 51, 52, 53.

^d *Pblegon*, pag. 49.

^e See

But when Astronomy afforded no suitable Eclipse in that *third* Year, the same *Kepler* did

(5) Change his Hypothesis, and would, as groundlessly, have *Pblegon's* reading to have been B for Δ : Or that this Eclipse happened on the *second*, and not the *fourth* Year of Olimpiad, on which *second* Year he supposed *Christ* was crucified. But when Astronomy afforded no suitable Eclipse on that Year neither, the same *Kepler* did

(6) Propose a still different ^{*} Emendation of the Words of *Pblegon*; and instead of Δ or the *fourth* Year, would have us, as groundlessly, to read Δ , without any Number at all; or that the Eclipse happened in general *on the Year of the 202^d* Olympiad only: Hoping that this Way of speaking might denote the *first* Year of that Olympiad. On which Year he found such an Eclipse as he was willing to suppose *Pblegon* might have in his Eye when he wrote his Testimony. So that *Kepler* alone has advanced no fewer than *four* several Hypotheses for this Purpose.

(7) The next Attempt I take to be *Kirchius's* Calculations already mentioned; which when they afforded no proper Eclipse on the *second* or *fourth* Years, the only ones for which he supposed there was some Authority, he was trying farther for some other Eclipse that might agree better to *Pblegon's* Description. Nor did he probably wave the Calculation of this very Eclipse; since it had been pitch'd upon by *Kepler*. But seeming weary with so many *unsuccessful* Trials, one of which he probably esteemed this of *Kepler's* Eclipse, he put it off to uncertain Futurity. Nor have I heard that he ever resumed those Calculations any more.

(8) The next Attempt I look upon to be that which I was sometime ago told of, *viz.* that perhaps some natural Eclipse of the Sun may be found that will coincide with some Earthquake at *Nice* in

^{*} Ibid.

^{*} Ibid.

Bitbynia; and so best of all suit *Pblegon's* Description; such as I have already confuted for the Days of *Pblegon*. Though I do not know that the Proposer of this eighth Method had any other than the Days of *Tiberius* in his Eye. However, when this Attempt came to nothing, I account

(9) The next Attempt to be the late Revival of the old Hypothesis of *thick Clouds* over *Judea*, or over *Jerusalem* only; together with that of *Kepler's* last Hypothesis, for this Eclipse in the *first* Year of the Olympiad: With this farther groundless Emendation,ⁱ that Δ might, by Mistake, be put for A in the Copies; and so *Pblegon* might mean an Eclipse distinctly on the *first* Year of the Olympiad. But this still, as only concerning *Nice* in *Bitbynia*: Without a Word of *Jerusalem*. I come now to the

(10) And last Attempt; which I look upon as, in a Manner, a *new* one.^h This drops the City *Nice* in *Bitbynia*, and the Earthquake there; which Place is only named by *Pblegon*; and restrains the Consideration of the Eclipse itself to *Jerusalem*: Which City is not at all named by *Pblegon*. However, I take this Hypothesis to be, in some Respects, less absurd than any of the other. This gains near *Half an Hour* in reducing all from the Meridian of *Nice*, to the Meridian of *Jerusalem*. This gains farther almost a *whole Hour* by interpreting *Pblegon* of the *Middle* of the Eclipse at the *sixth Hour*; which I think all have hitherto understood of its *beginning*. This also gains full another half Hour, by following our *modern* Tables in *ancient* Eclipses, contrary, as I take it to *Dr. Halley's* own Determination elsewhere; of which presently; and, as it seems, contrary to *Kepler's* own Procedure in this very Eclipse before us. So that here is very near two compleat Hours gain'd, in

ⁱ *Dr. Sykes's Dissertation*, pag. 74.
Defence, pag. 64.

^h *Dr. Sykes's De-*

order to bring the Eclipse from the *fourth* to the *sixth Hour* in *Pblegon*. Whether these Advantages can be supported; or whether Dr. *Halley*, to whom, as I take it, is due the chief Honour of this Hypothesis, (though I suppose him wiser than to vouch for this Eclipse, as that described by *Pblegon*;) has really *helped*, or rather has not at the Bottom *hurt* this Hypothesis, we shall see hereafter.

N. B. I shall now describe the Course and Circumstances of this Eclipse, in the Words of Mr. *Domcke*, a learn'd German Mathematician, the Author of the excellent *Latin Explication* of Sir *Isaac Newtons Philosophy*: Who at my desire *constructed* it, according to the Calculation already published.

“ The Latitude of the Place where the Center
 “ of the Moons Shadow enters the Disk, $57^{\circ} 46'$.
 “ N. Its Longitude from the *London Meridian* $9^{\circ} 56'$.
 “ $51''$. Westward. The Latitude of the Place
 “ where the same Center leaves the Disk $27^{\circ} 57'$.
 “ N. Its Longitude from the *London Meridian* 86° .
 “ $12' 46''$ Eastward.

“ The Latitude of the intermediate Place, [of the
 Middle of the general Ecclipse] “ through which
 “ the same Center passes, $29^{\circ} 4' N$. Its Longitude
 “ from the *London Meridian* $32^{\circ} 41'$. Eastward:
 “ Which, according to the Maps, is near *Cairo*.

“ Supposing, with Dr. *Halley*, the Difference of
 “ the Meridians of *Greenwich* and *Jerusalem*, to
 “ be $2^h. 23'$. and the Latitude of *Jerusalem* 32° .
 “ The Ellipsis marking the Path of *Jerusalem*,
 “ upon the Disk, and the Path of the Center of
 “ the Moons Shadow, make it appear, that the
 “ Middle of the Eclipse happened at *Jerusalem*
 “ 23 Min. Afternoon: And that it wanted but half
 “ a Digit of being total there. But *Alexandria*
 “ lying more *Southerly*, and *Westward* with respect
 “ *Jerusalem*, it is very likely it was total there, with-
 “ in a few Minutes after Noon.

“ By the Difference of the Diameters of the Sun
 “ and Moon, and the Horary Motion of the Moon
 X from

“ from the Sun, I find the Duration of Total Dark-
 “ ness, where the Eclipse is Central, 1' 20". which
 “ differs but 20" from Dr. *Halley's*; and may be
 “ very well allowed on Account of the Diurnal
 “ Rotation of the Earth.

“ It appears also by the Scheme, that the Middle
 “ of the Eclipse happened at *London* about 7' after
 “ Nine a Clock, before Noon. At *Venice* 5' after
 “ Ten. At *Rome* 7' after Ten; and that it was
 “ Total, and near Central at *London*. At *Venice*
 “ it wanted less than a quarter of a Digit of be-
 “ ing Total: And at *Rome* it was just Total. So
 “ that the Center of the Moon's Shadow passed be-
 “ tween the two last Places; and came nearer *Rome*
 “ than *Venice*.

N. B. Take here also the additional Description
 of the nameless Astronomer in his Letter to me.
 “ The apparent Time of the true ϕ at *Nice*
 “ was at 0^h 20' P. M. The Luminaries being in
 “ the Oriental Quadrant, the Interval between
 “ the true and visible Conjunction to be substracted
 “ brings the visible Conjunction within a very few
 “ Minutes of Noon, in the Meridian of *Nice*.” Nor
 will the Reader fail observing how dexterously
 this Author has since changed his Calculation, which
 was first rightly made for the Meridian of *Nice*, and
 fitted it to the Meridian at *Jerusalem*. Perhaps one
 Reason might be that the Path of the Center of the
 Shadow which came no nearer *Nice* than 400 Miles,
 came almost within 100 of *Jerusalem*.

N. B. This is all upon the Foot of the Calcula-
 tion already published, by the nameless Astro-
 nomer, which I take to be an accurate Calcula-
 tion from his Modern Tables. But if we put
 it 12' sooner at *Jerusalem*, as Dr. *Halley* does,
 it will not then be Total at *Rome*, but at
Venice; and the central Shadow will pass all a-
 long the *Adriatick* Sea, or near the *Northern*
Coast of it: But still it will do little more
 than just touch *Peloponnesus* and *Crete*, without
 touchi

touching *Asia* at all: It will thence go over the *Mediterranean* Sea: And leaving *Jerusalem* about 100 Miles, at the very *Northern* Edge of the Total Shadow, will pass over the Deserts, and other unknown Parts of *Arabia*, unto the *Persian* Gulf, and somewhat beyond it; where it will leave the Earth:

But if, after all, we allow, upon Dr. *Halley's* Authority, of which hereafter, the 31' which the Eclipse ought to have come sooner than our Modern Tables determine, with the 12', his Calculation comes earlier than the printed Calculation made use of above,

The State of this Eclipse will be nearly as follows; I mean this with allowance for the diurnal Motion, which enlarges the Duration about a fifth Part.

	At Rome		At Nice.		At Jerusalem.
	H.		H.		X 31
Beginning	VIII 15.		X 61		XI 40
Middle	IX 24.		XI 13		XII 49
End	X 33		XII 20		II 18
Total Duration	II 18		II 14		XI $\frac{1}{2}$
Digits eclipsed	XI $\frac{1}{4}$		X		
Duration of					
Total Dark-	} 1 40				
ness along the					
Path of the					
Center.					

Its Course also will then be more *Northerly* over *Germany*, and the *South* Parts of *Greece*, yet without touching upon *Asia*. It then will go over the *Mediterranean* Sea; and pass near *Damascus* in *Syria* as far *North* of *Jerusalem* as Mr. *Domcke's* Construction determines on the *South* of it, and the Digits eclipsed there will be

as before about XI $\frac{1}{2}$. All which [*Constructions* of this Eclipse very well agree with my *Exhibition* of it by my *Copernicus*. This Eclipse was also of about 4400 Miles extent as all other *Eclipses of the Sun* are: And all along the middle Path of the Shadow it was *Central*; as all other *Eclipses of the Sun* are. It was also but about 10 Digits at *Nice*; from which its Center pass'd about 400 Miles *Southward*.]

O B S E R V A T I O N S.

I. ^a **T**HOSE *Catholick Christians* who, after the Apostolical Age, and before this Chronology was known; I mean *Clement of Alexandria*, *Tertullian* and *Lactantius*; and they only among the learned, thought that *Jesus Christ* preached but one Year, or rather Part of it, Beginning and Ending in the same Fifteenth Year of *Tiberius*. I omit here *Africanus* and *Origen*; both sometimes reckoned as of the same Opinion, since we know not exactly to what Year *Africanus* ascribed the Death of *Christ*: tho' most probably it was the same Year with *Eusebius*; who is justly supposed generally to follow his Chronology. And for *Origen*, tho' when he wrote his Books *Peri Archon*, above 20 Years before he died, thought *Christ's* preaching lasted but a Year and a few Months: Yet in his Book against *Celsus*, written much later, and wherein he quotes *Pblegon*, he rather makes his preaching to be near three Years, as I have proved from his own Words, in my *Pblegon* Pag. 10. both which Hypotheses, especially the last, is utterly inconsistent with the Present Mistake. However those three beforementioned, and any other *Christians* that agreed with them, I say, did not derive this their Opinion from Chronology, or the Year of *Pble-*

^a See Dr. Sykes *Disertation* P. 16, 17.

son's Eclipse; who is named by none of them; but from too securely following the fond Traditions and Expositions of the *Valentinians*, as to that ^a *Acceptable Year of the Lord*, mentioned by *Isaiab*, which those *Valentinians*, explained of *Christ's* preaching one Year only. This Mistake *Irenæus*, who was earlier than any of these three Writers, informs us of^b, as derived from those *Valentinians*; and fully confutes that Opinion from the Number of the Passovers of our *Saviour's* Ministry, mentioned in the Gospels, and from other Arguments. Nor indeed do we often meet with any such Mistakes among the *Catholicks*, but what they unwarily admitted from the ancient *Hereticks*: Some of which I have elsewhere^c observed, and traced to their true Original: And others of them might, I believe, be alike traced to the same Original. The *Catholic Christians*, who were upright and sincere Men themselves, tho' they abhorred the Doctrines and Practices of those *Hereticks*; and never admitted them to Christian Communion; yet did not they always sufficiently suspect and guard themselves against some of their Traditions of another Nature, as they ought to have done.

II. In Dr. *Halley's* Calculation^d of the Eclipse *A. D. 29*. I find no Allowance made for the *Acceleration* of the Moons mean Motion, since the oldest Observations of Eccipses: For which, in all the foregoing Calculations of the first Century I have allowed 31" and in those of the Second Century 29' and these, as near as ever I could learn, in Agreement to the Doctors own Determination. This I have all along esteemed one of Dr. *Halley's* greatest Discoveries in *Astronomy*: And which he informed the World of *A. D. 1695*. in the *Philosophical Transactions*, N°. 218 *Sub Finem*, in these Words: " If

^a *If. lxi. 2.* ^b *L. I. C. 1. §. 5.*

Authentick Records. p. 949—961.

^c *L. II. C. 36, 39.*

^d Dr. *Sykes's*

Defence, p. 64.

“ any curious Traveller or Merchant, says Dr.
 “ *Halley*, residing there would please to observe
 “ with due Care the Phases of the Moon’s Eclipse
 “ at *Bagdat*, *Aleppo* and *Alexandria*; thereby to de-
 “ termine their Longitude; they could not do the
 “ Science of *Astronomy* a greater Service: For in or
 “ near those Places were made all the Observa-
 “ tions whereby the Middle Motions of the Sun
 “ and Moon are limited. And I could then pro-
 “ nounce in what Proportion the Moon’s Mean
 “ Motion does *accelerate*: Which that it does, I
 “ think, I can demonstrate, and shall, God willing,
 “ one day make it appear to the Publick.” This
 Conclusion is confirmed, by what Sir *Isaac Newton*
 himself says, in the Second Edition of his *Principia*,
 p. 481. “ *Collatis quidem Observationibus Eclipsium*
 “ *Babylonicis, cum iis Albtegnii, & cum bodiernis,*
 “ *Halleius noster Motum medium Lunæ, cum motu*
 “ *diurno Terræ collatum, paulatim accelerari primus*
 “ *omnium, quod sciam, deprehendit.*” Which Words
 yet are drop’d in the Third Edition of that Book:
 By what Means I cannot certainly tell. Now my Al-
 lowance for this Acceleration of 1’ in three Periods
 of Eclipses or in 54 Years, must still cause about half
 an Hour’s Difference between me and others, who
 follow the modern Tables, in the ancient Eclipses
 of the First Century; and so proportionably in all
 other ancient Eclipses whatsoever. Which I always
 therefore place so much *earlier* than the best of our
 present Tables determine: And, as I thought, up-
 on Dr. *Halley*’s own Authority also. I say *earlier*,
 because if the Moon’s mean Motion be *accelerated*
 since the ancient Eclipses, the Month is now
shorter than it was in old Times; tho’ in a prodigi-
 ously small Degree; and so the same Number of
 Months reckoned backwards from our New and
 Full Moons including both our shorter and those
 longer Months, must reach *higher* from our Times,
 and imply the coming of Eclipses both of the Sun
 and

and Moon, to have been of old *earlier* than our Modern Astronomical Tables determine. This Allowance I have made in the foregoing State of the Eclipse *A. D.* 29. as from *Dr. Halley*: And shall ever make ~~it~~ in other old Eclipses, till I am satisfied that it is a Mistake. Which if it be, it behoves *Dr. Halley* to clear this Matter to the publick. It depending hitherto on his own Observations and Assertions, and on them alone. Only I shall add here, that I have just now found the Greatness of the Sun's Eclipse at *Athens* in the first Year of the *Peloponnesian* War, when some of the Stars were visible, as well as its Darkness noted as not at *Night*, but in the *Afternoon*; and its Recovery of *intire Light* before Sun Setting (all given us by *Thucydides*, who then and there lived) does necessarily require the Allowance here referred to, and that at least in the Proportion here determined, also, of 30' in 1620 or of 40' in 2160 Years. See my Map of the 8 Eclipses just published; and my Lectures on Eclipses p. 406.

III. ^a 'Tis certain that *Africanus* did not end *Daniel's* 70 Weeks, and could not place the Death of the *Messiah* till the 16th of *Tiberius* or the 2^d Year of the 202^d *Olympiad*. His own Original Number Sixteen is preserved in both those *Greek* Citations of it which are still extant; ^b That in *Eusebius*, and that in *Syncellus*. The Second Year of that *Olympiad* is also express'd in *Jerom's Latin Version*, as well as in both the Originals: Which is also the 16th of *Tiberius*. Both the *Greek* Copies, together with *Jerom's Version*, agree also, that there were 490 Lunar or 475 Solar Years from the 20th of *Artaxerxes*, and the 4th Year of the 83^d *Olympiad*; i. e. from 444 compleat Years before the *Christian Æra*. Now if we deduct 444 Years from 475 Years, we shall have 31 compleat Years of the *Christian Æra*; which falls into

^a *Dr. Sykes's Diff* p. 17. 18. *Defence* p. 37. 40. ^b *Eusebius. Demonst.* VIII. p. 389, 390, 391. *Syncell.* p. 322, 323. *Hieron.* in *Dan* ix.

the Middle of the iii^d Year of the 202^d Olympiad, and almost into the Middle of the xviiith Year of *Tiberius*. So that there can be no Dispute but the Greek Number sixteen is not *too large*: tho' it may possibly be disputed whether it be *not too small*. Accordingly the Learned Editors of the New Edition of *Jerom* have justly put *sexadeca*, sixteen, in the Margin of one of the Places where his present Copy had *fifteen*; by way of Correction of those Modern Copies.

But as for that Consequence, whereon all this Mistaken reasoning depends, *viz.* that if *Africanus* or any Writer thought *Daniel's* 70 Weeks ended at any particular Year, they must therefore suppose that Christ dy'd the same Year, it is of no force at all. I have already^a noted that the Prophet *Daniel* does not say that *just then*, but *after those Weeks* of *Years* *Messiah* shall be cut off. Which way of speaking allows a Latitude of half one Week of Years, or of 3 Years and a half, by the utmost exactness of Calculation. Accordingly I myself have several Years ago declared my own Opinion to the World, that the 70 Weeks ended at the Beginning of *A. D.* 30: Altho' I did then, and ever do agree that *Jesus* of *Nazareth* was not crucified till *A. D.* 33. See *Supplement to Lit. Accomp. of Propb.* p. 87. Nor can I devise by what Consequence any supposal that *Africanus* thought *Christ* died on the 15th Year of *Tiberius*, or the 4th Year of the 201st Olympiad which is in the former part of *A. D.* 28. can agree with the other Supposal, that *Phlegon's* Copy cited by *Africanus* ascribed his Eclipse to the 1st Year of the 202^d Olympiad, and favoured *Kepler's* Eclipse which was on that first Year, towards the End of *A. D.* 29. This reasoning is to me very mysterious; or rather altogether unintelligible.

^a *Phlegon* p. 33. *Dan.* ix, 26.

IV. 'Tis also certain that *Philoponus's* reading in *Pblegon* of the *second* Year is only ^a a Mistake of the Transcriber, for the *fourth*. Since in a few Lines afterward he has himself given us from *Pblegon's* Olympiads, undeniable Evidence, that so it was in *Pblegon's own* Copy then before him. The additional Clause will put this Matter past Dispute: Which I shall therefore here repeat, according to my former Translation. "The same Thing [*viz.* that the Eclipse was on the *fourth* Year of the 202^d Olympiad] "is proved also from the History of [*Tiberius*] *Cæsar*: For *Pblegon* says, *He began to reign on the second Year of the 118th Olympiad, but that the Eclipse happened in the fourth Year of the 202^d Olympiad.* So that if we compute from the beginning of the Reign of *Tiberius*, unto the *fourth* Year of the 202^d Olympiad, there are pretty near nineteen Years, *i. e. three of the 198th, Olympiad, and sixteen of the other four:— That Year was the nineteenth Year of the Reign of Tiberius Cæsar*; wherein the Crucifixion of *Christ* for the Salvation of the World happened: As also that surprising Eclipse of the Sun which happened thereupon, in this unwonted and unnatural Manner." Those that will not correct Mistakes of Number in old Copies, (which are some of the Things the most frequently mistaken by Transcribers of all others) by such Evidence out of the Author himself, are past my Conviction.

V. It is still pretended, that this extraordinary and supernatural Eclipse is mentioned by ^b no body, by no Grecian, by no Roman Authors, but by Christians only: And is therefore not to be depended on. This Assertion in the Mouth of such a Writer or Writers as appear under the Person of *Origen* in his *Latin Commentary*, is not very strange.

^a Dr. Sykes's *Dissert.* p. 55, 56, 57. *Defence*, p. 40, 41, 42.
See *Pblegon*, p. 25, 26.

^b Dr. Sykes's *Defence* p. 50.

His Ignorance seems to have been gross enough to permit him so to reason. As the intire Mahner of his Reasoning seems to me, I confess, rather like that of a loose *Heathen*, bantering some ignorant *Christians*; than that of the grave and learned *Origen* in earnest vindicating the *Christian* Evangelists. But that at this Time of Day, any Man, pretending to learning, should still argue thus is very strange. ^b For to say nothing of those *other Heathen Writers* hinted at but not named by the Ancients for this Eclipse; I have already published the Testimonies of *Abgarus Toparch* of *Edessa*; of *Tiberius*, the Roman Emperor; of the Acts of *Pilate*, or the like original Accounts in the *Roman Archives*; of *Thallus* and of *Pblegon*, two *Heathen* Chronologers as Witnesses thereto. Every one of which Records, upon a through Examination I verily believe to be Genuine Testimonies of primitive Antiquity. They that after all this, complain that no *Greek* no *Latin Writers* mention this Eclipse are almost past my Conviction also. But this Pretence will be more thoroughly confuted hereafter.

VI. *Pblegon* or *Thallus*, or the Authors which they transcribed, might not at all know whether the extraordinary Eclipse they spake of were at the ^c Full, or at the New Moon or at any other Time of it. It appearing by the *Christians* Replies to what the *Heathens* usually alledged in order to evade this Attestation to the Gospel, that till the Christians forced them to it, the *Heathen* did not own it to have been at the full Moon or to be supernatural; as I have formerly observed. So that the Passages out of *Pblegon* or *Thallus* &c. are no way render'd suspicious by their taking no Notice that this extraordinary Eclipse was at the Full Moon. Nay the taking such Notice would rather have implied that they must then

^b *Pblegon* p. 7, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24. ^c See Dr. Sykes, p. 10, 11, 23, 36. *Pblegon*, p. 7, 8, 11, 21, 24, 26, 27, 35, 36.

have been *Christians*, and not *Heathens*, by their acknowledgement of such an illustrious Miracle wrought for the Confirmation of *Christianity*.

VII. As for the Number of Total Eclipses of the Sun that had^a been taken Notice of before the Days of *Phlegon*, greater than that in the first Year of the 202^d Olympiad produc'd by *Kepler*, I reckon these following. (1) That famous one foretold by *Thales*: And indeed, the first pretending to be foretold by any of the *Greeks*: (2) That prodigious one mentioned by *Plutarch*, out of *Xenophanes*^b, which lasted a whole Month. (3) That other perfect Eclipse, as it is there styled, when the Day became Night, from the same *Xenophanes*. (4) That extraordinary one when *Xerxes* was coming into *Greece*. (5) That when *Agathocles* was sailing into *Africa*. (6) That at *Rome* when the Plays were exhibited to *Apollo*. (7) That noted by *Julius Obsequens*. (8) That in *Dio* and *Lucan*. (9) That before the Death of *Augustus*. (10) That related by *Plutarch*, as seen by himself. Of most of which see the original Accounts in my *Lectures on the ancient Eclipses* at large. These greater Total Eclipses our present Fragments of ancient Authors relate. But how many more such Accounts; as for certain very many more there then were, *Phlegon* read in the ancient Authors, besides the great Eclipses of his own Time, we cannot now certainly determine. All the learned well know how very few of the ancient Books, extant in the Days of *Phlegon*, are now preserved. And those who look over the Indexes of ancient Authors, cited by such as lived about that Age, in *Fabricius*; and compare them with any Index of those now extant, will easily see what a great Disproportion there is between them. I believe I shall not be esteemed extravagant, if I say that *Phlegon* in the second Century might easily have seen above four Times as many Accounts of Eclipses

^a *Dr. Sykes's Defence* p. 67, 68, 69. ^b *De Placitis Philos.* c. xxiv.

earlier than his own Time as our present Records afford us : Which brings the Ten forementioned great Eclipses to more than forty. The Learned Mr. *Mason* I am sure, will think my Computation a very modest one; who believes, ** We have not now the hundredth Part of the Writers which Macrobius had in his Time*; which was the fifth Century of Christianity. So far is also plain that there now are, and then were, in every Period of Eclipses or in every 18 Years, about 8 Eclipses of the Sun, of longer Duration somewhere, and every way more remarkable than that *A. D.* 29, now under our Consideration.

VIII. Comets not only *may*, but certainly *will*, in long Periods of Time, sometimes cause Eclipses of the Sun. This is undeniable: And almost as plain as that the inferior Planets more frequently cause those *small Eclipses* which we call their *Transits* over the Sun. And as these small lower Planets, which are a vast way off from us, cover in their Transits but a very inconsiderable Part of the Sun's Body from us; so, if such a large Planet as *Jupiter*, or even *Saturn* were to revolve as Comets where those do, they would cause much larger Eclipses. Nay if they did but interpose between us and the Sun at 30 Times the Distance of the Moon, ≈ 7200000 Miles: *As the alike large Comets certainly may*, they and their immense Atmospheres together might cause *Eclipses* of the Sun; and that not only for a Part of, but sometimes for much more than a whole Day. For these Assertions I venture to appeal to all skillful Astronomers, particularly to Dr. *Halley* and Mr. *Hodgson*: Neither of which, can, I suppose, be so unacquainted with this part of the Theory of Comets as to dispute what I now say: Tho' such *Cometary Eclipses* may not perhaps have hitherto come much under their Consideration.

** At the End of Bp. Chandler's Vindication of the Defence of Christ. vol. ii. p. 33.*

IX. If therefore such a large Cometary Eclipse of the Sun was seen at the Passion of the *Messiah*, the Effects of it (without any Danger of either a Deluge or Conflagration: Or without the Comets being seen or known otherwise than during the Eclipse: And without any Suspicion than that such Eclipse was caused by a Comet) might be much the same with those mentioned in the *Testament of Levi*, and the *Recognitions of Clement*: The Rocks might then be naturally rent: The Sun seem for a considerable Time to be *put out*, or *extinguished*: The Rays of the Sun might appear, and dismally appear a great while through the Chaotick Atmosphere of the Comet; which being all over Hurry and Confusion, might cause the *fiery* Orb of the Sun to appear to *tremble*. The Tides of the Ocean and large Seas might then be extraordinary, and cause *Com-motions in the Waters* to an uncommon depth, and in an uncommon Degree. Nor is it improbable that the *Waters* of some Lakes might then run down into certain of the newly opened Clefts or Fissures of the Earth, and thereby be absorbed, or *dried up*: Which are the several uncommon *Phænomena* in the fore-mentioned Books hereto relating. To say nothing of the *Disorder of the whole Sublunary Creation*; or of the *Subterranean World*, there also intimated; as quite of another and an higher Nature, than the the rest of the *Phænomena* we are now treating of.

X. Since therefore there may be *Solar Eclipses*, and *Solar Total Eclipses* by the Interposition of Comets, I still say, 'tis no way improbable, as I conjectur'd 'about 33 Years ago, that the famous total Eclipse of the Sun, mentioned by *Herodotus*^d, as *Xerxes* was moving from *Sardes* to the *Hellepont* in the Spring

^a See Dr. Sykes's *Defence*, p. 48. ---55.
New Theory, *passim*.

^b Phlegon, p. 3, 6.

^c Praelect. vii. de *Eclipsibus Antiquis*.

^d Dr. Sykes's *Defence*, p. 54, 55.

of the 480th Year before the *Christian Era*, was of this Sort: While all Astronomers and Chronologers agree that no such Eclipse could then happen by the Interposition of the Moon. Nor is there any Pretence for removing the Expedition a Year backward, as some have been willing to do, in order to gain such a Lunary Eclipse. *Herodotus* himself, by mentioning another real Eclipse of the Sun some Months after the Total one, to which the Astronomical Tables agree, secures us that this was the true Year of the former extraordinary Eclipse also, and no other*, as I formerly observed. However, let us try whether the Spring of the former Year will afford a Total Elipse of the Sun there by the Interposition of the Moon, or not, from the following Calculation.

<i>A. D.</i>	1	6	24	9	42
Years.	400	4	28	24	20
+	80	5	23	40	52
+	1	4	9	37	25
=		3	1	42	37
=		3	22	27	5
+	<i>Apr.</i>		17	10	2
=		4	9	37	7
rest		7	20	22	53
<i>d.</i>	8 (17)	7	9	26	00
			10	56	53
<i>b.</i>	21		10	40	1
	33		16	52	

☉ in <i>Aries</i>	23	0
☾ in <i>Aries</i>	24	0
diff.	1	0
mean	18	(17) 21 33
Time	—	40
<i>April</i>		
<i>Nice</i>	18	(17) 20 53
or	+	2 10
<i>Sard.</i>	18	(17) 23 3
=		1 50
=	18	(17) 21 13

☾ Lat. 14 North
Node Descend
Total for some Min.
about 1600 Miles
South of *Sardis*. Digits
eclipsed at *Sardis* a-
bout two: As in *Cal-*
vistus.

* *Phlegon*, p. 38.

So that there was but a very small Eclipse of the Sun in the Spring this Year at *Sardes*.

I also still say*, that 'tis no way improbable that the great Total Eclipse mentioned by *Plutarch*, and probably seen by him also, was occasioned by the Interposition of a Comet. *Plutarch* might write the Treatise wherein he mentions this Eclipse as *ἰσχυρῶς* lately seen, about *A. D.* 100 or a little later. Accordingly *Kepler* tried to find such a Lunary Eclipse as *Plutarch* describes many Years both before and after that Year; but without Success. However, the late Suggestion that the Eclipse *April 30 A. D.* 59. which happened in *Greece* about 3 or 4 a Clock in the Afternoon, 40 or 50 Years before, while it is describ'd as having lately happened, and to have begun presently after Noon, seems to me too absurd to obtain the Approbation of Astronomers: Especially since, after all, the Author of the Calculation of the Eclipse *A. D.* 29. in his Letter to me assures me, that upon a nicer Computation this Eclipse was but just Total along the Path of the Center, much less was it so great and so long Total any where as *Plutarch's* Description requires. But of this Eclipse more hereafter. So that both *Herodotus's* and *Plutarch's* Eclipses must either have been absolutely *Miraculous*, or, they must have been *Cometary Eclipses*: As I suppose that most *providential*, or, if I may still use that Word, *Supernatural* Eclipse to have been, which fell out at the Passion of the *Messiah*. I shall here add three farther Confirmations of these *Cometary Eclipses*, as now and then, tho' exceeding rarely, happening: The first that the Words of *Tertullian* seem to imply the like *Cometary Eclipse*, perhaps in his own Time, and seen by him; certainly in his own Neighbourhood, when he thus speaks to *Scapula* the Governor of *Africa*, §. 3. *Sol ille, in conventu Uticensi, extincto*

* *Phlegon* p. 39. *Dr. Sykes's Defence.* p. 35.

pene Lumine adeo portentum fuit, ut non potuerit ex ordinario deliquio hoc pati positus in suo bypsomate, & domicilio. Habetis Astrologos. The Commentators afford us no Light about this difficult Passage. So I only set down the Words themselves. The *Second* Confirmation of these Cometary Eclipses is the State of the *Annals of China*, and of the numerous Eclipses they contain: And which, as they do generally agree pretty nearly to our Astronomical Calculation of Solar Eclipses by the Moon: So do they mention several Eclipses, which such Tables do no Way represent to us: And which, by Consequence may probably some of them have been no other than Cometary Eclipses. The *third* Confirmation of these Cometary Eclipses is, that great round, well defin'd Spot seen by several Persons on the Body of the Sun, *September 23. A. D. 1730.* a little before Sun setting: whose Diameter was estimated at a twentieth Part of the Sun's Diameter: And which, had it been twenty Times as near to us as it then was, would have ^aequalled the Comets mentioned by *Seneca* and *Hevelius*, whose apparent Diameters were as great as the apparent Diameter of the Sun: And so, if interposed, might have caused a *Total Eclipse of the Sun*. The Account of this Spot was delivered in and read before the *Royal Society*, *October 22d. 1730.* And by the Description, it seems to have been no other than a Comet then interposed between the Sun and the Earth.

As to the great Eclipse before the Death of *Augustus*, since neither *Dio* nor *Jerom*, the Relators, mention the Circumstances of it, we can only say, that no such natural Eclipse, made by the Interposition of the Moon, and visible near *Rome* has been found about that Time by Astronomers; and so it might probably be a *Cometary Eclipse* also. As for certain must that prodigious one mentioned by *Plutarch* from *Xenophanes* have been, if it be esteemed a proper Eclipse, and not rather a darkness of another Nature, like that at the Death of *Julius Cæsar*, which lasted

^a See *Dr. Sykes's Defence*, p. 48—52

about a Year. See my Lectures upon Eclipses, p. 425, 426.

XI. It is not to be supposed, that the three Hours Darknesh or Eclipse at our Saviour's Passion was *intire* Darknesh, or the Darknesh of a *Total Eclipse* during all the three Hours. This seems to me disagreeable to the Prediction of *Jeremiah*, and to the Evangelical History ^a of what was said and done in that Interval: which generally required a good Degree of Light. Nor is it agreeable to the Nature of any Eclipses, whether Lunary or Cometary: In both which the *Total Darknesh* is but of a small Duration in Comparison of the *whole Eclipse*. Nor in ordinary Lunary Eclipses is it ever so much as the twentieth Part of the whole Darknesh. Nor will *Pblegon's* Description be other than the exact Truth, that this was the *greatest Eclipse that had been ever known*, tho' the *Total Darknesh* should have lasted but the twentieth Part of the three Hours, or nine Minutes only: which nine Minutes Duration is near twice as long as is the Total Darknesh in even the greater ordinary Total Eclipses. This I have for some Time esteemed to be the true State of this Matter: Tho' I now suspect it to be commonly mistaken. Nay it seems to me, that the grand Objection against the Application of *Pblegon's* Eclipse to the Darknesh at the Passion of our Lord has been founded on this very Mistake; as if this Darknesh must be supposed a *Total Darknesh* overspreading *πάσαν τὴν γῆν* or *οἰκουμένην* all the *known World*, or all the *Roman Empire* at once for *three whole Hours* together. This indeed would easily be supposed so amazing a prodigy, that almost every *Greek* and *Roman History* would have been full of it: Which we do not find. But let this Mistake, this groundless Mistake be corrected, both from the Prophecy of *Jeremiah*, from the Evangelical History, and from the Nature of all solar Eclipses, and the

^a Zach. xiv. 7. Mat. xxvii. 35.—50. Mark xv. 24.—37. Luke xxiii. 33.—46. John xix. 18.—30.

Difficulty will vanish. And that this is not an Evasion of mine only started now on an emergent Difficulty, but the natural Sense of my Mind upon a former Examination, take my own Words, written above three Years ago, upon this very Occasion, out of that Paper whence I have already transcrib'd some part of this.

“ N. B. Since the Prediction of this supernatural Eclipse by *Jeremiah*, as well as its Account in the Gospels, seem to me to imply, that it was not Total during its three Hours continuance: and yet *Pblegon* describes it as Total: We may justly suppose, as is the Case in all other Total Eclipses, that the Darkness gradually encreased from the sixth to the ninth Hour; and that at the ninth Hour, when our Saviour gave up the Ghost, [*And the Vail of the Temple was rent from the Top to the Bottom, the Rocks rent, and the Graves were opened, and many Bodies of Saints which slept arose*] it became for a while Total but not otherwise.” Only in this Case the intire Eclipse will rather have lasted about six Hours; and the Total Darkness 18' and the Total Shadow must be rather supposed to have reached a tenth Part of the Roman Empire: All which I still incline to as the most probable Determinations. Nor shall we be surprized to find that a *partial Eclipse* of the Sun for perhaps 5h. 42' over nine Parts in ten; and a *Total Eclipse* over the remaining tenth Part of the Roman Empire, = 18' is not mentioned by any more of the Greek and Roman Historians, than we find it to have been: Especially when,

XII. I may venture to affirm, that the Ancient Accounts we have of this Eclipse are *seven* Times as many, including both the *Heathen* and *Christian* Writers, as we have of any other of the ancient great Eclipses whatsoever. For if the Reader look into

into my former Collection of those Testimonies, he will find that ^b *Origen* is the 15th in Order of Time: And yet he wrote but a little above 200 Years after the Eclipse it self. Whereas of the ten other most eminent Eclipses of the Sun, before *Pblegon*, already set down, the original Authors that relate them, are in three Centuries for *six* Eclipses but *one*, and for the other *four* but *two*; as the Reader will easily observe in my *Lectures upon the ancient Eclipses*, where the Words of such original Authors are distinctly set down. So that 'tis amazing how not only the Ignorant Spurious *Origen* of old, but any more learned Modern Writer at this Day, can make such heavy Complaints^c, as if this were a most peculiar Instance of the Silence of the Ancients; and that Evidence were here particularly wanting: While in reality, the ancient Testimonies for it are rather after an uncommon Manner, *very distinct* and *very numerous*.

XIII. Every one of the Characters, in Number Six or Eight, that *Pblegon*^d gives us of his Eclipse, exactly agree to the supernatural Darkness at the Passion of *Christ* April 3 *A. D.* 33. But *not one* of them properly agrees to the natural Eclipse of the Sun mentioned by *Kepler*, November 24 *A. D.* 29.

(1.) *Pblegon's* Eclipse, by all the real Evidence we have, was on the *fourth* Year of the 202^d Olympiad. And on the same Year was the Darkness at the Passion of *Christ*. But *Kepler's* Eclipse was on the *first* year of that Olympiad: To which no one ancient Testimony does affix it. And tho' the Situation of an Event in a Chronology, that goes distinctly Year by Year, as was the Case of *Pblegon's* Olympiads; and is the Case of *Eusebius's* and *Jerom's* *Chronicon*, and of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, &c. might now and then be placed by Transcribers *one* Year too high

^b *Phlegon* p. 1—10. *Defence*, p. 23, 36, 50, 51.

^c *Dr. Sykes Dissertation* p. 9. *De-*

Dr. Sykes Defence p. 64—71.

^d See *Phlegon* p. 46.—50. and

or too low : Yet with *Kepler*, to suppose it set no less than *three* Years wrong is plainly intolerable. Nor will the Agreement of all the Ancients, that relate *Phlegon's** Testimony, as belonging to this very Year, whether denoted by the 4th Year of the Olympiad, or the 19th of the Reign of *Tiberius*, or both, permit any sober Person to make so wild and groundless an Hypothesis.

(2) *Phlegon's* Eclipse was the *greatest that ever had been known before*: Which greatness in Solar Eclipses, that are Total, is chiefly seen in the length of the Duration of *Total Darknes*. This we know was true of the Supernatural Darknes at our Saviour's Passion : Its whole Duration being no less than three, if not six Hours : and by Proportion, its total Darknes about nine, if not eighteen Minutes. Whereas the Intire Duration of the longest natural Eclipses is very rarely more than two Hours and an half, and the Duration of their Total Darknes very rarely so much as *five Minutes*. And as for *Kepler's* Eclipse, its whole Duration about the central Parts, as we have seen, was but $2^h 18'$. and its Darknes not Total either at *Rome*, at *Nice*, or indeed at *Jerusalem* : And where it was the longest Total, by Mr. *Hodgson's* Calculation $1^h 31'$ and by Dr. *Halley's* own Calculation, it was so but $1^h 40''$ or somewhat longer than the third Part of the greatest Duration of that Total Darknes which we had here *April 22 A.D. 1715.* $\equiv 4^h 10''$. which Eclipse yet was never pretended to be the *greatest that was ever known*. Nay indeed, as I have noted already, every Period of Eclipses, or 18 Years, affords somewhere about 8 Eclipses of longer Duration of Total Darknes than this before us. Nor is it possible that there should be very long Durations of Total Darknes in Winter, but only in Summer ; by reason of the Sun's lesser Distance, and greater Diameter in our *Winter* ; and greater Distance,

* *Phlegon*, p. 32, 33.

and leffer Diameter in our Summer. *November, December, January*, were then, and still are the Months for the *least*; and *May, June, and July*, the Months for the *greatest* Duration of Total Darkness; as all good Astronomers very well know. *Kepler* therefore, as an excellent Astronomer, who knew this so well, is almost inexcusable in proposing the present Eclipse to answer the Character of the *greatest Eclipse that ever was known*, tho' others, little acquainted with the Doctrine of Eclipses, may better deserve to be forgiven when they weakly try to support such an absurdity after him.

(3) *Pblegon's* Eclipse was not only the greatest in it self, but the *greatest*, τὴν ἐγνωρισμένην πρότερον, the greatest of those that were *known, acknowledged and celebrated* in the World before. And to this Description the other ancient Testimonies agree; as they also agree that this Description suits the Darkness at our Saviour's Passion. Now for the Eclipse insisted on by *Kepler*, he is, I believe, the first Author, in the World that ever mentioned it. No Greek, no Roman, no Barbarian Historian says a word of it: Which Silence of all ancient Authors, as groundlessly pretended in the Case of *Pblegon's* Eclipse, when interpreted of that at the Passion of our Saviour, comes intirely Home to the Eclipse before us. To allude to the Words of the *Latin Origen*, "How could an Eclipse so *known, so acknowledged, and so celebrated* be so intirely pass'd over in Silence, as not to be mentioned by any Greek or Barbarian to have happened at this Time, the first Year of the 202^d Olympiad? Especially by those that have written Chronicles, and have taken Notice whenever any remarkable Thing was observed?" Yet is it in it self no Wonder at all, that the Eclipse *A. D.* 29. is never taken Notice of by any one, if *Dr. Halley's* Calculation be right; for then, as we have already demonstrated, its Total Darkness was so far

far from implying a *known*, an *acknowledged*, and a *celebrated* Total Eclipse, that by the Situation of the Total Shadow all the Way of its Passage through the *Roman Empire*, it must needs have been one of the *least known*, the *least acknowledged*, and the *least celebrated* Total Eclipse that ever was. There are but two Paths for such a Shadow through the *Roman Empire* possible, I mean where that Total Shadow shall be of all others *the least seen by Mankind*: And those two are, the one all along the *Mediterranean Sea*, and thence into the *Deserts*, and the rest of the little known Parts of *Arabia*. The other along the *Adriatick Sea*, and thence into the *Mediterranean*, and thence into the *Deserts* and the rest of the little known Parts of *Arabia*: which last was, in *Dr. Halley's* Calculation, the very Path of this Total Shadow. So that whether *Dr. Halley* has not hurt *Kepler's* Hypothesis more by bringing his Eclipse into such an unfrequented Path, into Seas and *Deserts*, than he has helped it by gaining it about two Hours in Time, may well be questioned: especially while that Time is not to be maintained on his own Principles; and while an *Innuenda* is hereby given that *Pblegon* had his Eye upon *Jerusalem* in this Eclipse; tho' he name it not; which will easily infer, he had a regard to what was done at *Jerusalem*, in this Year relating to his Eclipse: And if so, I believe, the result will be clear that he meant no other Eclipse at *Jerusalem*, than that which happened at the Crucifixion of *Jesus of Nazareth* there that very Year. Nor can *Dr. Halley* ever bring this Eclipse in any sense so near the *sixth Hour*, as the Evangelists expressly declare (agreeing with *Pblegon*,) that it began at the *sixth Hour* and lasted *to the ninth*; as will appear presently.

N. B. How *Kepler*, among his other Uncertainties as to this Eclipse, came to talk as if the Central Shadow passed *over Asia*, or over *Syria*,

4 *Dr. Sykes Dissertation*, p. 72.

neither

neither of which Countries did it so much as touch, by our present Calculation, instead of passing over the *Mediterranean Sea* and *Arabia*, I cannot certainly tell. It seems to me that he had so low an Opinion of this Eclipse in the present Case, that he never took the Pains particularly to examine it; but seeing by some Period of Eclipses, that either on the 24th or 25th of *November*, either about 10, or about 11, or about 12 a Clock, there would be an Eclipse of the Sun; and that perhaps it might be Total, a little while; and that its central Shadow might go over *Asia* or *Syria*, or some of the Neighbouring Regions; he proposed it with great Uncertainty and Inaccuracy, and never vouchsafed either to calculate it or to construct it, for either his own, or the Reader's Satisfaction. Nor have I ever met with any other Eclipse so grossly and carelessly treated by any Astronomer, as this was treated by the great *Kepler*. *How much greater Accuracy soever its being the only one, in or very near the intire 202^d Olympiad, that could, in the least pretend to be that described by Phlegon, has of late intituled it to.*

(4) In *Phlegon's Eclipse*, *The Day became Night, and the Stars appeared*. Which well agrees to the supernatural and long Darkness at our Saviour's Passion; but not to this shorter Eclipse before us. And all that know how long it is before the Eye, coming out of a light Place into a dark one, is disposed to see such small Points of Light as the Stars, will easily imagine that many more Stars would be visible in a partial Eclipse for 2^h 51' and a Total one for 9' or their Doubles, as I have computed the Durations for the Darkness at the Passion, than in the shorter *partial Eclipse* of *Kepler* for little above two Hours, and a *Total Eclipse* for 1' 40' only. How many Stars were visible in *Phlegon's Eclipse*, is not particularly said by him, nor by any. Only they must have been *more* than are

visible in our ordinary great and Total Eclipses, because he informs us that *Night came on*, and that this was a *greater Eclipse* than any of the other. Such a natural Eclipse I have already taken Notice of, as seen here in *England*, April 22 A. D. 1715, whose Total Darkness lasted, in the central Parts 4' 10", in which there were about a Dozen Stars visible. Now as to *Kepler's Eclipse*, when by Calculation *Jupiter* was below the Horizon, although along the Path of the Center, where there were commonly, all the Way from *Venice* to *Persia*, few or none of human Race to see them, there might be about half so many Stars visible; yet at *Rome*, at *Nice*, and at *Jerusalem*, as well as in all *Asia* and *Syria*, &c. it is a great Question whether any one Star, excepting *Venus*, which is frequently seen even in the Day Time, could be at all visible. At *Jerusalem*, indeed^a, the Digits eclipsed were about $11\frac{1}{2}$ at which Time, I have formerly noted, besides *Venus*, *Jupiter*, had he been above the Horizon, might perhaps have been seen; but that for the other Planets and fixed Stars, they hardly begin to be seen till $11\frac{3}{4}$ Digits are eclipsed. So that here was little sign of either the *Day's becoming Night*, or of a *Multitude of Stars appearing* in the Sky at this Eclipse; both which yet *Pblegon's Description* requires.

(5) *Pblegon's Eclipse* began at the *sixth Hour* of the Day, or at Noon; as did the Darkness at our Saviour's Passion. But *Kepler's Eclipse* began nearly at *Rome*, from Dr. *Halley's* own Authority already produc'd, 15' after 8, at *Nice* about 6' after 10, and even at *Jerusalem* about 31' after 10. And since *Jerusalem* ought to be out of the Question, unless the Point be given up, and *Pblegon* be supposed to have the *Jerusalem Eclipse* at the Passion in his Eye, the Labours of our three Calculators will come to just nothing: For still *Kepler's Eclipse* did, by the best Evidence, end at

^a Pblegon, p. 47, 48.

Rome about 33' after 10, and at Nice about 20 after 12, the former long before, and the latter somewhat after that *sixth* Hour most probably mentioned by *Pblegon*, and certainly by the Gospels for its *Beginning*. Which of these Darknesses or Eclipses best agrees to *Pblegon's sixth Hour*, every Reader will easily determine. Nor indeed, could the *third* or *fourth Hour*, naturally belonging to *Kepler's Eclipse*, be reduced to the *sixth* mentioned by *Pblegon*, but by these three Contrivances already intimated: (1) By taking the *Middle* of the Eclipse, instead of its *Beginning*: (2) By taking the Meridian of *Jerusalem*, instead of that of *Rome* or of *Nice*: And (3) By taking Calculations made from modern Tables instead of those made from the ancient, or instead of those from the modern Tables when corrected to the ancient Eclipses. Here is *Art* enough shewn; but no great measure of *Sincerity*.

(6) *Pblegon's great and extraordinary Eclipse* was accompanied, certainly in the same Year of the Olympiad, probably at the same Time, with a like *great and extraordinary Earthquake*, as far off *Jerusalem* as *Bithynia*: As was the Case of the Darkness or Eclipse at our Saviour's Passion. But on the Year, or at the Time of *Kepler's Eclipse*, we have not the least pretence of Evidence for any such Earthquake, in any Country whatsoever.

(7 and 8) If we suppose *Africanus's* Copy in *Syncellus* to be uncorrupt, and that, by Consequence, it had originally, as has of late been zealously pleaded^a, the Words [*At the full Moon*] and *from the sixth Hour [till the ninth:]* We have then a strong Attestation, that the oldest Copy of *Pblegon* we can now trace, did directly affirm, that the Eclipse described by him was a supernatural one, *at the full Moon*; and beginning at the *sixth Hour*, lasted *till the ninth*. Which are two of the plainest Characteristics possible of the Eclipse at our Saviour's

^a Dr. Sykes's Defence, p. 19—22.

Passion. And which once granted, I believe no Man living will doubt but this was no other than the Miraculous Darknes or Eclipse at the Passion. This I alledge as only *Argumentum ad Hominem*: And I think it a very strong one. And though I cannot myself insist upon it, as still believing those Words an interpolation in Syncellus's Transcript, (as I imagine all Men of critical Sagacity will agree (also,) yet was it not improper to be here produc'd in order to the Conviction of those of other Sentiments herein.

Now to suppose that *Pblegon's* Eclipse was not that *Darknes* or *Eclipse*, which the Gospels assure us happened at the Passion of *Christ* April 3 *A. D.* 33. but was the Eclipse which *Kepler* describes on November 24 *A. D.* 29. while every one of the particular and remarkable Characters, no fewer than six or eight in Number, directly and accurately agree to the former; and as directly and accurately disagree to the latter, is very extraordinary. I say still, *Credat Judæus Apella; Non ego.*

N. B. It may not be amiss to give here the Opinion of the most learned and most judicious of the present German Writers, *Fabricius*; who in his Account of this Passage of *Pblegon* has these Words*: *Hæc de admirandâ illâ, quæ Christo patiente contigit, Solis Obscuratione intelligendâ esse ne dubitarunt quidem veteres: — Et quanquam chronologicis quibusdâ difficultatibus permoti viri quidam doctissimi de aliâ Eclipsi loqui Pblegontem existimarunt, — non tamen usque adeo exploratæ mihi videntur illorum rationes, ut non malim veteribus assentiri; cum certissimum sit Pblegontem etiam aliâ de rebus Christi & Judæorum chronico suo inseruisse.* [Where he sets down the two other Passages of *Origen* out of *Pblegon*, inserted already in my *Pblegon*, Pag. 9, 10.

XIV. The state of *Kepler's Account* of this Eclipse, as it was produced to Dr. *Clarke*, supposing it was produced to him, being the very same as I before represented it, and no way altered by any later Calculations; it still remains to me a very difficult Problem, how so great and judicious a Person should so easily be persuaded to give up the Testimony of *Phlegon* for the *eighth* Edition of a Book, where it had stood *seven* Editions. This Problem is still to me utterly insoluble.

XV. As to the *Rents* or *Clefts* in the Rocks of *Jerusalem* spoken of in the Gospels; The being of such Rents or Clefts is undeniable: as are the open Appeals to them^b, as extant ever since the Crucifixion of *Christ*, and as Memorials of the great Earthquake at that Crucifixion, even in the *fourth* Century, undeniable also. What sort of Arguments, concerning ancient Facts, weigh with Metaphysians, and the like abstract and subtile Reasoners, I do not so well know. As for my self, who greatly despise those Subtilties in all such Cases, the Arguments from *Eclipses* and *Fissures of Rocks*, with those of a like Nature, which are capable either of *Mathematick* or *Ocular Demonstration*, move me a thousand Times more. Nor would it certainly be a small Objection against the Truth of the Gospel History, which assures us that the *Rocks were rent* at our Saviour's Passion, if, upon a through Examination of *Jerusalem* and the neighbouring Parts, no such Rents could be found in the Rocks there at this Day. Nor will all the Violence of *Inclination* nor Confidence in *Supposals* move me one Hair's breadth from what I find certain Evidence for; whether it be from *Mathematick* or from *Ocular Demonstration*: No small Degree of both which I think the *Christian Church* is in Possession of for the Application of *Phlegon's Eclipse* and Earthquake to

^a See *Phlegon*, p. 49, 50. And Dr. Sykes's Defence, p. 74.

^b See *Phlegon*, p. 44, 45, 46, 54. And Dr. Sykes's Defence, p. 60.

the Darkness and Earthquake at the Passion of our Blessed Saviour.

XVI. In order to cure or prevent some mistakes I here declare ^a, (1) That I think all good Christians, that can *disprove* any Arguments commonly used for Christianity, are at full Liberty to propose those *Proofs* to the World. But whether a *Supposal* only that a Man is able to perplex and puzzle the ignorant in any such Arguments, while they suspect that they can go no farther, will justify a good Christian in so doing, is not to me so clear. However, I am not my self much concerned at any such Attempts. For though they will, I believe, commonly procure no reward to the Authors; and do sometimes do much harm for a Time among weak People, who cannot examine Things to the bottom; yet do they usually promote deeper Examinations and Enquiries; and do thereby occasion the discovery of Truth; which in my Observation, has at length always tended to the better understanding, and firmer believing of true Christianity. (2) ^b That I always aim to avoid all personal Quarrels in such Disputes about ancient Facts; and indeed, in all Disputes whatsoever. I desire only to hear fairly all the original Evidence, without the Pleadings of the Disputants; and then to sum up the Evidence, as it lies in *puris Naturalibus*, in order to determine my own Judgment, or satisfy the Judgments of others. They that peruse my *Reply to the Earl of Nottingham*, will find what strong Reasons I have for such a procedure. (3) ^c That I esteem all and only those as *Original Evidence* and *Authentick Testimonies* to what *Pblegon* wrote, who lived while his *Olympiads* were extant; as they were to the Day of *Photius* in the ninth Century; and who *saw* or *wrote out* his Testi-

^a See Dr. Sykes's *Defence*, *Preface*.

^b P. 2.

^c P. 6. &c.
mony

mony. The learned Moderns can have no share in this: Since those Olympiads have been long lost: And so the Testimony can now neither be *there seen* nor *thence written out* by any of them. (4) That they were^a not the Christians, the Catholick Christians, but the old Hereticks, no other generally than the Followers of *Simon Magus*, that had the *scurvy Trick of Lying for God*, or of *Forging Books* not only in the *second* and *third*, but chiefly in the *first* Century; as I have already shewed: Nor are any of those *Authentick Records*^b that I depend on of that sort: But commonly the strongest and most Catholick Preservatives against them. (5) ^c That 'tis one thing to insert the *negative Particle* where we have two Copies, the one of which expressly inserts it, and the Coherence of both certainly requires it; as I did my self; and quite another Thing to insert it without a Copy, and contrary to the Coherence: Which was what alone I found fault with; and which all judicious and impartial Men will ever find fault with upon all the like Occasions. (6) That I always suppose that *Eusebius's Chronicon* is alone Authentick in *Jerom's* Version. The *Greek Chronicon* published by *Scaliger* being known to be a Composition of *Scaliger's* own, out of the Fragments of *Eusebius* preserved by *Syncellus*, &c. and not the genuine *Greek Chronicon* of *Eusebius* himself, which has been long since lost. (8) ^d That I never my self allow *double Senses* in Prophecies: Tho' I cannot much blame so very small a mistake in some of the Ancients, as is that of interpreting Prophecies of *Parallel Eclipses*, the Signals of *Parallel Judgments* on the same People of the *Jews*, without exactly distinguishing them asunder. But of those *Parallel Eclipses*, as Signals of *Parallel Judgments*, more hereafter.

^a P. 21. ^b See p. prius. ^c Dr. Sykes's Defence, p. 43, — 46.
156, 157. ^d P. 72, 73.

To conclude the whole. Since this intire Hypothesis, that the Darkness at our Saviour's Passion, which St. Matthew and St. Mark directly affirm to have extended over *πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*, " *all the Earth*, and St. Luke over *ὅλην τὴν γῆν*, *the whole Earth*, (of the same Signification, as I take it, as *πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμενὴν* *the whole habitable World*, or Roman Empire, subject to the Decree of Augustus, the Roman Emperor in St. Luke ii. 1. and in Josephus^b frequently,) was not an Eclipse of the Sun over that Empire, but barely a Collection of thick Clouds over Judæa or over Jerusalem only, which is the newly revived Hypothesis of the spurious Origen, I insist upon it, I absolutely insist upon it, that those who at this Day declare themselves of the same Opinion, in direct Opposition to the Sentiments of all Christian Antiquity, do produce some few Parallel Examples out of the Septuagint Version, out of the New Testament, out of the Apostolical Fathers, or even out of Origen's genuine Greek Works, where those Words are restrained to Jerusalem only, or indeed to Judæa only. I take this spurious Author to be the first that so expounded these Texts. And tho' there have been some modern learned Men^c whose Inclinations have led them sometimes to put the latter restrained Sense upon them, for the Land of Judæa only, (as I hardly believe any mortal Man, besides this spurious Origen, ever took them to mean no more than Jerusalem only;) yet have they not, I think, produced one single Parallel Example sufficient to justify such an Interpretation: Without which Examples we all know their Opinions are of no weight at all. The best they have, as far as I have observed, is that Luke iv. 25. *I tell you of a truth*, says our Saviour, *many Widows were in Israel in the Days of Elias, when the Heaven was shut up three Years and six Months; when great Fa-*

^a Phlegon, p. 5. ^b Antiq. viii. 13. 4. xi 6, 2. 5. 6. 13. xii. 2. 1, and 3. 1. xix. 5. 3. and 6. 1. ^c Dr. Sykes's Defence, p. 26, 27.

mine was ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ upon all the Earth: or, as our Translators have ventured to render it, throughout all the Land: as if this Famine might have been confined to the Land of Judæa only. But if we consult the Old Testament History here referred to, we shall find, that this very Famine occasioned Abab the King of Israel to send to find Elijab, without whose appearing no rain was expected, into all the neighbouring Countries, as well as into his own. * *As the Lord thy God liveth, says Obadiab to Elijab, there is no Nation, nor Kingdom whither my Lord hath not sent to seek thee. And when they said, He is not there: He took an Oath of the Kingdom and Nation that they found thee not.* As if all these neighbouring Kingdoms and Nations were herein concerned, as well as Judæa. And as for Phœnicia which was one of them, we know from the Annals of Tyre in Josephus^b, that this Drought did particularly reach into that Kingdom also. Until therefore some such Examples can be produc'd, I shall ever take the present Hypothesis for intirely Groundless; and no better than a Dream of the spurious Origen. And, what here deserves particularly to be considered, Not only several Copies in the Days of the spurious Origen, and in the Days of Maximus, had this reading in St. Luke's own Gospel, *There was Darkeness over all the Earth, by the Eclipse of the Sun:* But that Origen's own Greek Copies, 200 Years or more older than all our present Greek MSS. of the Gospels, own the same Words, τὴ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντων, by the Eclipse of the Sun, 'as the Words of one at least of the Evangelists themselves. So that I cannot but esteem this Dream of the spurious Origen, to be intirely groundless, and utterly unworthy of the Countenance of any learned Christian whomsoever.

Aug. 4. 1733.

WILL. WHISTON.

* 1 Kings xviii. 10.

^b Antiq. viii. 13. 2.

^c Phlegon p. 9.

N. B. Since I have been thus far obliged to prosecute what Discoveries I had made when I published the *Historical Memoirs* of Dr. Clark's Life^a, concerning *Pblegon's* Eclipse, I shall now go on to prosecute the rest of the Discoveries there intimated, which was done in the Words following, viz. " That I had discovered how none of the Astronomical Characters of Chronology, now preserved, reach earlier than about five hundred Years after the Flood, in the Sacred Chronology: That this Sacred Chronology is however to be taken from the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, *Septuagint Version* and *Josephus*, and not from our *Masorete* Copy; which last Chronology several of those ancient Astronomical Characters do plainly contradict: That the *Chinese* Annals, when determined by the *Julian* [*Lunisolar*] Year, of $365\frac{1}{4}$ Days, since the Olympiads began, and by the old Year of 360 Days before that Time; and when at their Beginning, they are reduced 500 Years later than they now stand, perfectly agree with the Astronomical Characters, and the beforementioned sacred Chronology, but not otherwise: That the Prophet *Amos* was the first that ever foretold Eclipses of the Sun, and an Earthquake; and the Prophet *Isaiab* the Second: And that he not only foretold an Eclipse of the Sun, an Eclipse of the Moon, and an Earthquake, but an Occultation of Stars [*the Hyades*] by the Moon; and that *Jeremiab* foretold the Eclipse of the Sun at our Saviour's Passion: All which exactly came to pass accordingly. That *Thales* foretold his famous Eclipse, not by Astronomy; which could not be done, till above

“ 400 Years after that Time ; but rather by
 “ learning it from the *Jews* in *Egypt* who
 “ had it from the Prophet *Isaiab*. That the
 “ grand *intermediate Breaches* in every one of
 “ the four Monarchies, were immediately pre-
 “ ceded by great Eclipses of the Sun ; and
 “ their Endings by great Eclipses of the Moon ;
 “ all visible in the same Monarchies. And that
 “ accordingly, 1736, the grand Period of the
 “ ten Kingdoms, or of the last State of the
 “ *Roman* Monarchy, will be peculiarly re-
 “ markable for such great Eclipses of the
 “ Moon, [as well as for the uncommon Num-
 “ ber of Eclipses of the Sun.] All which Di-
 “ scoveries are of the utmost Importance ; and
 “ by me *demonstrated* all along from Astrono-
 “ mical Calculations.



A P P E N D I X II.

Astronomical and Chronological Propositions.

I. **T**HE Astronomical Characters of Chronology now preserved in the most Authentick Records of the *Heathen* World, do none of them reach earlier than about 500 Years after the Flood, in the genuine Sacred Chronology.

(1) ^a *Diodorus Siculus* pretends, that the Astronomical College, which was sent out of *Egypt* to *Babylon*, and continued there, had Astronomical Accounts of no fewer than 473000 Years backwards, before *Alexander the Great*. Now this is really, as *Diodorus* himself confesses, a Number of Years in a manner, *incredible*. It very ill agrees with his own Accounts elsewhere, of the Time when that Astronomical College went to *Babylon* in the Days of *Belus* their Head, not 2000 Years before the Days of *Alexander*: Of which more presently. Indeed, it appears to be no other than a gross mistake of the old *Babylonish* way of reckoning; which we learn from ^b *Abydenus* and *Berosus*, was by *Sari*, *Neri*, and *Sofi*. It is agreed that their *Sari* contained 3600, their *Neri* 600, and their *Sofi* 60. But whether *Years*, as *Diodorus's* Reckoning supposed, or *Months* or *Days*, may be questioned. It is however agreed, that three of their Antediluvian Kings reigned 18 *Sari* a piece: So that we may thereby easily answer that Question. If they meant *Years*

^a II. 31.

^b See New Theory, 4th Edit. p. 165, 166. And Essay upon the Old Testament. Appendix, p. 201, 202, 207, 210.—213.

with *Diodorus*, 18 *Sari* amount to no fewer than 64800 Years. If they meant *Months*, they amount to no fewer than 5400 Years: which Numbers are both too extravagant to be admitted. But tho' they meant Days only, they amount to no fewer than 180 Years. In a very good Agreement with the natural length of the Reigns and Lives of Kings before the Flood, according to the Sacred History. Nor have we here, at the Bottom, any other Indication, than that, when the Lives of Men were at least ten Times as long as they have been in later Ages, these *Babylonians* reckoned them after a very prudent manner, not by *single Years*, which would have been very incommodious; but by *Decads of Years*, each Year according to the old Reckoning containing 360 Days. *Diodorus* therefore, a *Greek*, here plainly mistook the meaning of the old *Babylonians*, when they reckoned backward, for Ostentation, 473000. And what was originally meant of *Days* he understood of *Years*. Now 473000 *Days* amount to no more than about 1300 Years. Which dated from the taking of *Babylon* by *Alexander the Great*, 330¹/₂ Years before the Christian *Æra* takes its first Date, but about 1610 Years before the Christian *Æra*: Which is about 1300 Years after the Deluge, by my Chronological Table.

(2) *Berosus*, the old *Babylonian* Historian, who wrote in *Greek*, pretends* that their Chronology reached however 150000 Years backward from his own Time: which was somewhat later than *Alexander the Great*. Now as this agrees very ill with *Diodorus's* Account of the Origin of their Astronomical College by *Belus*; as also with *Diodorus's* fore-mentioned 473000 Years; so has the Fallacy of this Number been already guess'd at by me and others, and it has been justly supposed, that 150000 *Days* have been here, as before, pompously put for so

* *Essay on the Old Testament.* Appendix, p. 203, 204.

many Years. And this the rather, because at that rate those Days at, 360 to a Year, amount to no more than $416\frac{2}{3}$ Years, and take Date from the famous *Aera* of *Nabonassar*, in the *Babylonian* astronomical Canon. However, we have neither here, nor in the foregoing Number of *Diodorus*, any real *astronomical Character* for such vast Antiquity as these two Numbers 373000 and 150000 Years lay Claim to, and which we are now enquiring for. Nor is there, I believe, any sober Chronologer now in the World, that believes either of these Numbers of Years to be genuine.

(3) *Diogenes Laertius* pretends*, that the *Egyptian* Astronomers had preserved an Account of all the Eclipses of the Sun there visible, in Number 373, and of the Moon 832 [in all 1205] and this during the long Interval of 48863 Years; from the Days of *Vulcan*, to *Alexander the Great*. Now as to this pretence, it is much more modest than the two former of 473000 and 150000 Years: But very ill agrees with them. However this Author affords us here a sure and certain *Astronomical Character*, and in it self a very valuable one, by which we may try whether the right Number be 48863 or not. I mean by the Number of the distinct Eclipses of the Sun 373, and of the Moon 832, in this whole Interval: As he asserts them to be. The Proportion of the *Solar Eclipses* here, as compared with the *Lunar*, I mean those that were visible in *Egypt* only, is, I confess, very just for any particular Place; and seems a strong Argument that the Numbers were derived from some Authentick Records, and from actual Observations. But then the Numbers of these Eclipses themselves are so far from requiring the long Interval of 48863 Years, as is here asserted; that, if no Clouds or Mists interposed, there would the like Number have been visible in about 1250 Years: And with all the Allowance we can

make for Clouds and Mists in that Countrey, which is less subject to them than any other known Countrey in the World, that Number of Eclipses can hardly require more than 1900 Years for their Observation, which we shall see hereafter, is in a Manner the true Antiquity of such Astronomical Observations, both at *Babylon* and in *Egypt*, and that from a positive and direct Testimony, as old as the Days of *Alexander the Great* also. If therefore we add 1900 Years to $330\frac{1}{2}$, we shall have $2230\frac{1}{2}$ Years before the Christian *Æra*: which by my Chronology is no less than 700 Years after the Flood.

(4) 'Tis supposed both by Bishop *Stillingfleet*^a, Bishop *Cumberland*^b, and Sir *John Marsham*^c, that the famous *Egyptian* Historian and Chronologer *Manetho*, Keeper of their publick Records engraven on Pillars, under *Ptolemy Philadelphus*, reckoned no fewer than 36525 Years from *Vulcan* to *Alexander the Great*, and that he filled up that long Interval with his Dynasties of Gods and Semigods, of Heroes and of Kings. Now if this were really his Determination, it was still a more modest number than the three former, but very different from them and still not a little different from the Numbers of the no less famous *Eratoſthenes*, Keeper of the great *Alexandrian* Library about the same Time whose *Lacterculus* of the old Kings of *Thebes* extends but about 2000 Years backward from his own Time: Which is between 600 and 700 Years after the Deluge, in my sacred Chronology^d. But then I venture to say it, and to say it upon a through Examination, that we have not the least real Evidence, that *Manetho* did ever dream of such an immense Number of Years, as 36525, for his Dynasties; but the direct contrary, as I have elsewhere fully shewn^e. The forementioned great Men have here suffered

^a *Stillingfleet Origin. Sacrae*, I. 5. ^b *Cumber. Sanchoniatho*, p. 416, 417, 418.

^c *Marsh. Chron.* p. 2.

^d See my *Chronological Table*.

^e *Essay on the Old Testament*.

Appendix, p. 190—195.

themselves

themselves to be imposed upon by the unknown Author of the *Vetus Chronicon*, one never heard of, that we can find, before the fourth Century: As if *Manetho* himself had been of his Opinion; contrary to the clearest Evidence. He expressly limited his Dynasties within 3555 Years, as I have there shewn. Nor indeed, as Sir *John Marsham* observes, does this Number in the *Vetus Chronicon*^a 36525 seem to be of a Chronological Nature, but rather an old Astronomical Ænigma, declaring the Author's Knowledge of that anciently deep Astronomical Mystery, that the Solar Year, tho' in common Use allowed to be only 360, or at most 365 Days, was in reality $365\frac{1}{4}$, for that is exactly the importance in Decimals of the Number 36525: Nor do I apprehend any thing farther in that Number at all.

(5) *Herodotus* assures us, that the^b *Egyptian* Priests shewed him 330 Statues of their ancient Kings; as if they had then had so many Kings in *Succession* one after another in the same Kingdom, which at the moderate Computation of 30 Years to a Reign, is 9900 Years; and reaches backward much beyond the *Mosaick* Creation. But then, as *Manetho*, the Keeper of the *Egyptian* Pillars and of the ancient Records thereon engraven, complains of the Mistakes of *Herodotus*^c, as being not sufficiently acquainted with the *Egyptian* Affairs; and as we have seen that he and *Eratosthenes* intirely contradict such an extravagant Antiquity of the *Egyptian* Kings: So does there seem to be no more Mystery in this, than that the Statues of the five or six collateral Dynasties or Kingdoms in *Manetho*, conquered at last and brought to *Mempbis* the Conqueror's Capital, were shewed by the Priests to *Herodotus*, by way of Ostentation, as *Successive*; when they were very often really *Contemporary*. Nor is the fifth Part of that Sum

^a Chron. p. 10. ^b Essay on the O. T. p. 222. And Jos. Antiq. viii. 6. 2. ^c Ibid. p. 182.

of 9900 Years quite 2000 Years: Which well agrees with the rest of the *Egyptian* Chronology from *Manetbo*, *Eratosthenes*, *Diodorus*, and *Diogenes Laertius*; as we have already seen. See also my Chronological Table, under the Dynasties of *Egypt*. Nor must I here quite pass over in Silence another strange Story in the same *Herodotus* *, that the Sun had twice risen in the *West*, and set in the *East*, in the Interval of 11340 Years. What to make of this strange Paradox, with such a stated formal Number of Years, I cannot tell. Unless it be either a blind Intimation of the old State of Astronomy, before the Commencement of the Diurnal Motion, when the Sun really *rose in the West*, and *set in the East*; as I have formerly conjectured, *New Theory* Edit 4. p. 99. or whether it be not an aukward Description of a true Fact in the present State of Astronomy; viz. that the Sun had twice, or in two Canicular Periods, risen when the *Egyptian* God, the Dogstar, set, and twice risen when he rose, (which he does once in every such Period of 1460 Years, and twice in two Periods of 2920 Years) I cannot tell. However if we suppose the *Egyptian* Priests to have meant this latter, and that these Years began with their first God *Vulcan*, they will be very agreeable to the *Egyptian* Chronology, as already stated; and come naturally within the 3555 Years of *Manetbo*'s Dynasties; which perfectly agree with the sacred Chronology.

(6) Our great Astronomer Dr. *Halley* in the *Philosophical Transactions* for A. D. 1715, N°. 344. proposes a Physical Method for discovering the Age of the World; with an Intimation of his Hopes that, when it has been tried, it will imply the Age of the present State of the World to have been many thousand Years before the *Mosaick* Creation. It is this; that supposing the Saltiness of the Sea to be owing to the

Salt Particles which are washed into it by the Rivers, as they pass along the Earth; and that by Consequence, the Increase of its Saltness is for the main gradual and regular; the Proportion of that Saltness may now be tried; and again 500 or 1000 Years hence: And from the Difference of those Trials, a Calculation may be then made, How long ago it must have been that such Saltness began; or how long ago the present State of Things began. Now as to this Proposal, it may now with all my Heart be put in Practice by Dr. *Halley* himself; and by him be recommended to the future Trial of Posterity 500 or 1000 Years hence. In the mean Time, we have no Evidence, that I know of, that the Sea does owe its Saltness to the Salt Particles gradually brought in by the Rivers, and so becomes saltier and saltier. Nay if we compare our modern Travellers Trials, how deep a Man can now sink into the Sea of *Sodom*, one of the saltiest Seas or Lakes in the World, with the like Trial in the Days of *Vespasian*, above 1600 Years ago, related in *Josephus*^a, (which sort of Trial Dr. *Halley* complains the Ancients never made) we shall rather think that the Sea was saltier then than it is at present: Intirely contrary to Dr. *Halley's* Hypothesis. However, a supposed Trial and Comparison 500 or 1000 Years hence, can give this Generation no Satisfaction; and so deserves at present no farther Consideration. Only so far it may be of use to us now, as it implies Dr. *Halley's* great good Will towards discovering the Age of the World to be greater than the *Bible* gives it; and withal his intire Ignorance of any present surer Indication of such its Antiquity. He would hardly have proposed here so uncertain and remote a physical Method of Enquiry, had he been Master of any surer and nearer either Astronomical or Physical Method for such a Determination.

^a *De Bello*. iv. 8. 4.

(7) The most authentick Accounts we have now preserved of ancient Astronomy or of ancient Facts confirm the foregoing Conclusion; that there are no sure Indications that contradict, but many such as confirm the sacred Chronology, and all reach no higher than about 500 Years after the Deluge.

Thus *Josephus* informs us that the *Posterity* of *Seth* the Son of *Adam*, (see *Numb.* xxiv. 17.) were inventers in Astronomy; and that whereas *Adam* had foretold a *Deluge* and a *Conflagration*, they erected two Pillars with their Accounts of such their Inventions, the one of Brick, the other of Stone: Which were standing in *Terrâ Seriate*, in the Days of *Josephus*. This seems indeed to be a great mistake in *Josephus*, though a very pardonable one: I mean because he appears not to have known that the *Egyptian* Name of the famous *Sesostris*, who is related to have been a great Erecter of such Pillars was *Seth*; as *Plutarch* informs us: which Ignorance of his, in all probability, occasioned this Confusion of Persons, and made him ascribe those Pillars to *Seth*, the Son of *Adam*, in *Terra Seriate*; which were clearly erected by *Seth* or *Sesostris* the *Egyptian* Monarch in that Place. See more of this Matter in the Essay on the *Old Testament*, Append. p. 159, 160.

Thus *Alexander Polyhistor* informs us, out of *Eupolemus*, that “ *Enoch* was the Inventer of Astronomy, and not the *Egyptians*; that the *Greeks* said, *Atlas* was the Inventor, and that he was the same Person with *Enoch*, the Father of *Mathusalem*; and learned all of the Angels of God.” This appears to be true by an Astronomical Fragment of *Enoch* still extant; which implies his Knowledge of the Number of Years, Weeks, and Days from the Creation, till the 165th Year of the Age of *Enoch*: And that 365 Days went to a Year all that Time. See *Authent. Rec.* p. 278, 279.

Thus *Simplicius* assures us, from *Porphyrus*, ^a That *Callisthenes*, the Scholar of *Aristotle*, *Alexander the Great's* Master, sent from *Babylon* Astronomical Observations, beginning 1903 Years before *Alexander* took *Babylon*, or 2233 Years before the Christian *Æra*: Which is by my Chronology 696 Years after the Deluge. Nor is there, that I know of, any just reason for Suspicion as to the genuine Antiquity of these Observations; as the following Note will farther secure us. For thus we learn from *Diodorus Siculus*^b, that, about this very Time, the *Egyptians* sent out *Belus*, at the Head of a College of Astronomers, to *Babylon*; who becoming the first King of *Assyria* or *Babylonia*, was most probably the very same Person who was afterwards consecrated into the *Babylonian* God, *Bel*. ^c Whether this *Belus* was not sent by *Osymandes*, the very ancient King of *Thebes*, who made himself a Circle of 365^d Cubits round, corresponding to so many Days in the Year, for the Observation of the rising and setting of the Stars, may be questioned: Since he appears to have been the first *Egyptian* King that was curious enough in Astronomy to do so: And we have already seen that the Number of the old *Egyptian* Eclipses before *Alexander the Great* direct us nearly to this Age; I mean after the five additional Days were discovered by King *Affis*, and before ^e *Eratoſthenes's* *Laterculus* of the *Theban* Kings began; which by my Chronological Table, was about 740 Years after the Flood.

Thus *Pliny* assures us ^f that *Epigenes* gaye an Account of 720 Years Astronomical Observations at *Babylon*, engraved upon *Lateres Cœtiles*; the old Materials with which the Tower of *ſ Babel* was built. These seem to me to have been part of the

^a Marſham's *Chron.* p. 474.

^d *Authent. Rec.* p. 1045. 1046.

Table.

^f Marſh. *Chron.* p. 474.

^b I. 28.

^c §. 49.

^e See the *Chronological*

ſ Gen. xi. 3.

old *Babylonian* Observations, made by the Astronomical College, which came out of *Egypt* long before the Days of *Nabonassar*: with whom our present Astronomical Canon begins. And had we these *Babylonian* and forementioned *Egyptian* Observations of Eclipses now preserved, the ancient Chronology of these famous Kingdoms, would soon be settled, to every ones entire Satisfaction. But, *Non licet Chronologis adeo esse disertis!* However, we have hence found no pretence for any such Antiquity of these Nations, as is in the least inconsistent with the sacred Chronology.

PROPOSITION II.

PROBLEM.

To Determine the Antiquities of the Chinese Annals from Astronomy.

OBSERVATIONS.

- (1) **T**HAT the pretended ancient ^a Tradition of some of the *Chinese*, as if their Kingdom reached no less than 200,000,000 or 300,000,000, of Years backward, or, as others, that their Astronomy reach'd no less than 143127 Years earlier than the 104th Year before the Christian *Æra*, is not only disbelieved by their best Historians, and destitute of all certain Characters of Chronology, but is contradicted by their more certain History of *Fohi* himself: Who is allowed to have been their original Founder, and to have collected their wild and scattered People into a body, and begun in some Measure a regular Government among them: as both *Martinius* and *Couplet* assure us. Nor does this last particular Number seem other than

^a See *Soucier's Observations*, Tom. II. p. 16, 17.

Technical or an Astronomical *Epocha*, like the *Julian* Period with us, made *a Posteriori* only; instead of a real *Epocha* of ancient History: as the Learned Astronomer *Pere Gaubil* observes. See *Souciét*, *Tom. II. p. 17.* And as for the former Numbers of two or three hundred millions of Years backwards, as if their ancient Records extended so far, I shall not think it worth while operosely to confute them. If they were even supposed *Days* instead of *Years*, they will exceed all rational belief, and contradict all the other good Evidence we have of the World's Age. When we are disputing whether any Astronomical Characters, or authentick Evidence much exceeds 4000 or 5000 Years since the Deluge, or 6000 or 7000 since the Creation; and when the real Histories and Annals of the *Chinese*, like those of all other Nations, are confined within 5000 Years or thereabouts, to start a pretence of 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 Years backwards, that can no way be examined, and no way to be proved, is to trifle with the Learned World. Nor shall I think it worth my while to enlarge farther on such uncertain and incredible Pretences.

(2) That a modern learned Man already named, *Pere Gaubil*, the great *European* Astronomer at *Pekin*, has lately reduced no fewer than 16 of the old *Chinese* Eclipses to Calculation, and has verified^a all of them, excepting the first: Of which more presently: And thereby secured us of the Agreement of the *Chinese* Annals with Astronomy since the Olympiads began *A^o. 776* before the Christian *Æra*, during 2509 Years backwards. I have also been informed by that accurate Antiquary and Chronologer Mr. *Mason*, that a Friend of his at *Berlin* has, in some general way, examined about 500 of their Eclipses, and finds them

^a *Souciét*, *Tom. I.*

commonly not disagreeable to our Calculations, so that since the Olympiads began, the *Chinese Annals* seem much better attested to, by the Agreement of their Accounts with the Heavens, than is the *Astronomical Canon* it self; of which yet none of the Learned make the least Question.

(3) That the *Conjunction of the five Planets* mentioned in the *Chinese Annals*, as seen in the Reign of *Cbuenbio*, their fifth King from their Founder *Fobi*, the same Day on which the Sun and the Moon were in Conjunction, was about 500 Years later than it is set in their present Annals: This fell out 2012 Years before the *Christian Æra*, in the 15^o of our *Aquarius*; or in the *Chinese Constellation Cbe*: which is 500 Years later than it stands in *Couplet's Annals*.

(4) That the place of the *Winter Solstice* among the fix'd Stars, accurately observed by *Hi* and *Ho* the Astronomers, in the Days of their seventh King, *Yao*, when they attempted to settle the *Lunisolar Year* for him, was also about 500 Years later than it is set in their present Annals. This Observation was made, in the 1851 Year before the *Christian Æra*: which is 497 Years later than it now stands in *Couplet's Annals*.

These two last Observations are fully proved by the famous Astronomer *Cassini*, and the Calculations largely produc'd by him in *Loubier's History of Siam*: p. 219, 220.—251, 252.—258. See the *Essay on the O. T. Append.* p. 250, 251, 252.

(5) That the forementioned Astronomers *Hi* and *Ho*, who made the Observation of the *Winter Solstice*, and attempted to settle the *Lunisolar Year*, are describ'd in *Couplet's Annals*, as equally active and busy in Astronomical Matters under their seventh King *Yao*, and under their twelfth King *Chum Cam*: while yet from the Beginning of the seventh

seventh, to the End of the twelfth, were no fewer than 228 Years: and from the End of the seventh to the Beginning of the twelfth no fewer than 98 Years: And from the Middle of the seventh, to the Middle of the twelfth 163 Years. Which Employment of the same Astronomers in two such distinct Reigns, is too absurd to be admitted, in any other Sense than as those two Reigns were nearly contemporary with one another.

(6) That there is an eminent and very ancient Eclipse of the Sun, in the small Sign *Fang* (belonging to our *Scorpion's* Head, and extending no farther than from δ in *Bayers* ^a Catalogue to about 5 Degrees onward,) mentioned in the *Chinese* Annals, on which the Credit of those Annals before the Olympiads, very much depends. ^b*Pere Gaubil* supposes this Eclipse to have happened in *October* 11, *Ao.* 2155, before the *Christian* *Æra*; as the Series of their present Annals requires: And for the Neglect of whose Calculation, or rather Observation, the forementioned Astronomers were put to Death. However, he finds that this Eclipse was not quite of one Digit in Quantity at *Pekin*; just after Sun rising, and by Consequence, lasted not very many Minutes after Sun rising in *China*. This small Quantity and short Duration ill agree with the Capital Punishment of two great Astronomers for not observing it; and indeed, if such Astronomers did not, hardly any Body else would have taken Notice of so small and short an Eclipse as this was. However, if we go more nicely to Work, and allow backward 1^h 11' for Dr. *Halley's* Acceleration of the Moon's mean Motion, it will appear that this Eclipse was over in *China* above an Hour before Sun rising: And tho' we should allow but a small Part of that Quantity, yet will the Eclipse be quite over be-

^a See *Martinus* p. 57 ^b *Souciety* *ubi prius*.

fore Sun rising. So that this could not be the same Eclipse which the *Chinese Annals* mention. Nor is there any other Eclipse herein mentioned before the Olympiads. Nor indeed, had this probably been noted, but because it proved the unhappy Occasion of the Death of *Hi* and *Ho*, the great Astronomers of that Time. So that hitherto we have no sure Astronomical Characters for the Confirmation of the *Chinese Annals* in their present State, earlier than the *Greek Olympiads*.

(7) However, since in one Period of Eclipses the Nodes of the Moon come round so as to be in or near to the same small Sign *Fang* as they were before, we may add such a Period $18^y. 11^d. 7^h. 43' \frac{1}{3}$. and remember to allow between two and three Hours for the Interval of Eclipses towards Night, later than those in the Morning, and we shall have the next corresponding Eclipse between four and five a Clock in the Afternoon on *October 22^d A° 2137*. Of which, that the Reader may be better satisfied, I shall present him as usual my Calculation, or Approximation as follows, and this just upon the same Sign *Fang*.

☉ Eclipsed

(200)

☉ Eclipsed October, A°. 2137.

A. D. 1 6 24 9 42					☉ Libra 11 12				
Years backward } 2000 0 22 1 40					☉ Libra 6 54				
+ 100 10 7 6 5					Diff. 4 18				
+ 20 4 13 25 13					Mean } d h ' "				
+ 17 3 2 21 35					Time } 21 1 37				
— 6 14 54 33					O ^h ob. } 1 11				
= 0 9 15 9					= 21 11 56				
+ O ^h ob. 2 28 4 28					+ Diff. Merid. } 7 48				
= 3 7 19 37					Greenw. and Pekin. }				
Rest 8 22 40 23					= 21 19 44				
d 21 8 16 0 20					+ 8 40				
0 6 40 3					= 22 4 24				
b 13 6 36 12					☉s Lat. North 22				
' 7 3 51					Node Ascend.				
					Annular				

N. B. The Center of this Eclipse's *Penumbra* passed by the *Southern Limit* of *China*; and by Consequence the *Digits* eclipsed there were almost 12 as at the *Northern Parts* near *Pekin*, they were about three. And the middle of the Eclipse it self happened there, about Sun sett, or half an Hour after five in the Afternoon. So that this exactly answers all the Characters of the Eclipse in the *Chinese Annals*, and was at a Time of the Day when every body would naturally take Notice of it: And differing but 18 Years, or one common Period of Eclipses from

from the present Determination of those Annals. This implies no more than a Mistake of so many Years in the present Constitution of those Annals, as standing 18 Years, and no more, too remote from the *Christian Æra*.

(8) The *Chinese Annals* do also mention a *Famine of seven Years Duration* under *Tang* their 26th King; about the same Time when we know from the Words of ^a *Moses*, both in our Copies, and that of *Josephus*, that such a *seven Years Famine* was in all lands, and over the Face of all the Earth.

C O R O L L A R I E S.

(1) **T**HE first eleven *Chinese Kings* therefore are, in general, placed about 500 Years too early in the present Series of the *Chinese Annals*.

(2) The Seventh King *Yao*, and the twelfth *Cham Cam*, under both of whom the same Astronomers *Hi* and *Ho*, flourished, were nearly contemporary to one another.

(3) The Settlement of the present *Lunisolar Year*, and the present *Lunisolar Cycle* of 60 such Years in the *Chinese Annals*, cannot be proved much older than the *Greek Olympiads*; tho' they be firmly demonstrated since that Time.

(4) There being no other form of a Year which accounts for the first *Chinese Eclipse* being set 18 Years too high in their Annals, but that most ancient Form of 360 Days to a year; and that Number of Days being shorter than the *Lunisolar* 18 Years in about 1300, it is highly probable, that the *Chinese Monarchy* in general used originally their 60 Years Cycle with a Year of 360 Days only; till about a Century before the *Olympiads* began; when the same 60 Years Cycle was

^a Gen. xli. 54, 55.

first applied to the later *Lunisolar* form: And that the modern false Supposal, as if their old Cycle had been applied to the same form all along, has been one Occasion of their ancient Annals not perfectly agreeing with the Astronomical, and other authentick Characters in this particular.

(5) It seems therefore to me very probable, that the first eight distinct Kings in the *Chinese* Annals reigned distinctly, and in certain *Northern* Provinces: And that the first of the Imperial Families *Hia* whose Name was *Yu* or *Ta Yu* i. e. *Yu the Great*, was the first proper Emperor of *Cbina*: And that some of the later of the eight first Kings, were contemporary with some of the first Successors in this first Family; and that the first six Kings, with almost all those other Governments that were very ancient, used no other than the Year of 360 Days, with its Cycle of 60 Years. But that *Tao*, the seventh of them, upon the Advice of *Hi* and *Ho*, the Astronomers, introduced the *Lunisolar* Year of $365\frac{1}{4}$ Days into those Provinces. Which Innovation when the Contemporary twelfth Emperor or King *Cbum Cam* endeavoured to introduce into all his Dominions, by the Means of the same Astronomers, he failed of his Design, and suffered the Astronomers to be put to Death; and so the old Year of 360 Days continued in those Parts till 1300 Years afterward: about which Time the *Lunisolar* Year seems to have been admitted over the whole Empire. Which Hypotheses, and which only, render the ancient *Chinese* Annals agreeable to the other ancientest Records of Mankind to their own certain Astronomical and Chronological Characters; and to the sacred Records of the *Jewish* Nation. See Essay on the O. T. Append. p. 201, 202.

(6) This is also strongly confirmed by the exact Coincidence of the seven Years Famine in *Moses*, with the like seven Years Famine in the *Chinese* Annals

Annals, under *Tang* the 26th King, according to this Reckoning: which in the ordinary Reckoning fall too soon; and cannot be made to coincide with them. The particular Years of this short Reign, on which the Famine fell, are not noted in the Annals; otherwise we might have here exactly adjusted the *Jewish* and the *Chinese* Chronology together to a Year. However, these seven Years falling now naturally into seven Years about the middle of that Reign, are a very remarkable Coincidence; and a strong Confirmation both of the *Jewish* and *Chinese* Records, as far backward as that Time.

(7) What an inquisitive Friend here suggested to me, is no Way improbable, *viz.* that it was the *seven Years Plenty* peculiar to *Egypt* at this Time, as *Moses* informs us, that brought such vast Wealth into that Country, by the Sale of their Corn^a to other Countries, which had a seven Years Famine only, as occasioned that Kingdom to aggrandize itself afterward; and, under *Ramestes* the Great, and under his Grandson *Sesostris* the Great, to conquer no small Part of *Asia*, as far as *China* itself; as the ancient Historians (largely collected here by Sir *John Marsham*) inform us. See *Marsh. Chron.* p. 352.—383.

PROPOSITION III.

THE *Wisdom* of the *Egyptians*, in all which *Moses* was afterward learned,^b seems to have been no other than what *Abraham* taught them, when he went down into that Country.

This *Wisdom* I take to have been, (1) The sacred Rite of *Circumcision*, which the *Egyptians*, especially their Priests, admitted and obliged Foreigners to admit e're they would communicate their Mysteries,

^a Gen. xlii. 5. xlvii. 13, — 26.

^b Act. vii. 22.

their Learning, or their ancient Traditions to them. This I take for an eminent Memorial whence the *Egyptians* received their Learning: I mean from no other Person than him from whom they received that Circumcision which was the Condition of its Communion, and which they could take from none but *Abraham*: Who alone had it so early after the Flood^b. (2) Astronomy, this not *Josephus* only, as we shall see presently, but *Eupolemus* also an *Heathen*, informs us of, when he assures us, that “*Abraham* taught the “*Egyptians* many Things, particularly Astrology, “[Astronomy] and the other Sciences thereto belonging: tho’ as deriving all from *Enoch*.” *Artabanus* also, another *Heathen*, informs us, that “*Abraham* taught *Pharaob* the King of *Egypt* Astrology^d, “[Astronomy,] and lived there no fewer than 20 “Years.” *Berosus* also in *Josephus* * informs us, that “*Abraham* was a Righteous and a great Man, and “skilful in celestial Sciences.” As *Melo*, the bitter Enemy of the *Jews*, in *Eusebius*, also confesses he was “a wise Man, or a Philosopher.” (3) Arithmetick, and, (4) So much of Geometry as was used in Surveying. Of this *Josephus* informs us, from his old Records now lost, “That^e *Abraham* was held “in great esteem by the *Egyptian* Wise Men, and “instructed them in Arithmetick and Astrology “[Astronomy] of both which Sciences, the *Egyptians* “were till then unacquainted.” Nor does it seem to me at all improbable, that That *Arithmetick* which the *Egyptians* made use of in Measuring the *Arouræ*, or *Egyptian Acres* after the Annual overflow of the *Nile*; from which *Herodotus*, with likelihood enough, derives the Original of Geometry, or^f Surveying; and that *Astronomy*, which deter-

^a Gen. xii 10. &c.

^b See Sanchonjatho ap. Euseb.

^c *Præp.* I. p. 38. IX. 17. *An Essay on the Old Testament.*

^d IX. 18.

^e *Antiq.* I. 7. 2.

^f *Præp.* IX. 19.

^g *Antiq.*

VIII. 2.

^h I. 3. 3.

mined the Solar, or rather Luni-solar Calendar to the Seasons, which *Josephus*^a implies they knew before *Moses*, were peculiar Branches of that *Arithmetick*, and that *Astronomy* which *Abraham* had taught the *Egyptians* long before *Moses*; and which *Moses*, brought up in the *Egyptian* Court, could not but learn from those *Egyptians*, at the second Hand. Nor is there otherwise any Pretence for the original Learning of the Posterity of *Ham* above that of the Posterity of *Shem* or *Japhet*, but the contrary: Nor is there any good Account that I know of but this, how the Posterity of *Ham* by *Mitzraim* came to have such extraordinary *Wisdom* above the rest of the Nations, so early as the Days of *Moses*.

P R O P O S I T I O N IV.

THE Astronomical Characters, and other ancient authentick Records strongly confirm the Chronology of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, of the *Septuagint* Version, and of *Josephus*; but directly contradict that of the *Masorete Hebrew*.

In Order to understand the Meaning of this Proposition, the Reader is to remark, that according to the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, the *Septuagint* Version, and *Josephus*, we have about 600 Years more between the Deluge and the Birth of *Abraham*, and so 580 between our Time and the Time of the Deluge, than the *Masorete Hebrew* affords us. Of which, See *Essay on the Old Testament*, p. 20.—29. The Necessity of the admission of which 580 Years we are to demonstrate under the present Proposition. I do not mean from the Bible itself only, which has been done by my self, and many others already; but from such other^b Astronomical and

^a I. 3. 3.

^b See *Essay on the O. T.* p. 23.—26.

Chronological Characters as are now before us.

(1) The first ^a Astronomical Character that would be proper for me to produce, as to the Interval since the Deluge, would be that of the Number of Revolutions of the Comet, which I have long esteemed the Instrument of Providence in causing that Deluge. But because the Revolution of that Comet is nearly the very same with the Difference between the Chronologies I am now comparing; that Revolution being 575 or 576 Years: while that Difference is 580, I cannot hence pretend to determine between the two Chronologies. If we suppose *seven* Revolutions to have been compleated when that Comet last appeared in 1680, we shall have the 2349th before the *Christian Æra*, for the Year of the Deluge; according to the *Masorete* Copy. But if we suppose *eight* such Revolutions to have intervened, we shall have the 2929th Year before that *Æra*, for the Year of the Deluge; as I have shewed in the two last Editions of my *New Theory* p. 217, 218. So that we cannot pronounce by this Character which of the two Chronologies best agrees with Astronomy. I proceed therefore to such other Characters as will determine this Question.

(2) About 100 Years before the Deluge, according to the *Masorete* Copy, we have full Evidence from the Annals of *China*, and those, as we have seen, strongly confirmed by Astronomy, that *Fohi* gathered the scattered people of the Country together; who lived wild before; and formed them into a regular Society and Kingdom, and became their first King: which is all absurd, in that shorter *Masorete* Chronology, but very just and rational in the longer Chronology of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, the *Septuagint* Version, and *Josephus*, which allows

^a Dr. Brett's *Chronological Essay*, p. 3, — 15.

all this to be about 500 Years after the Deluge and not sooner. Nor does this appear to me other than a Demonstration on the Side of that longer Chronology.

(3) This is also strongly confirmed by the length of the Lives and Reigns of the first nine of the ^a *Chinese* Kings, who frequently lived about 120 Years, and reigned about 90 Years; but no longer. This does not ill agree with the Lives and Reigns of Men beginning 500 Years after the Flood: As in the longer Chronology; but greatly disagrees with the Lives and Reigns immediately after it, in the Shorter. This is obvious upon the least Comparison. This also appears to me little less than a Demonstration on the Side of that larger Chronology.

(4) In the Account of the *Armenian* most ancient Kings, we find that ^b *Haic*, but five Generations from *Noah*, and one of the old wicked *Giants* who assisted at the building of the Tower of *Babel*, in Opposition to divine Direction, was scattered with many of his Companions, into *Armenia*; and there founded a Kingdom, and waged Wars; such as could no way be understood but upon a great Multiplication of Mankind. Now the larger Chronology allows 400 Years before the Birth of *Peleg*, ^c when the Confusion of Tongues, and the Dispersion of Mankind happened: While the Shorter Chronology allows but 100 Years for that Interval. Nor do I esteem of this otherwise than of a strong Demonstration of the Truth of this longer Chronology.

(5) In the foregoing Enquiry into the *Egyptian* Antiquities we have discovered, that the *Egyptians* began to make ^d Astronomical Observations, and sent out a College of Astronomers to *Babylon*, about 2230 Years before the *Christian Æra*: And

^a See *Essay on the O. T. Append.* p. 252. Authent. Rec. p. 966. *Chronol. of the O. T.* p. 60.—65. ^b Authent. Rec.

p. 967, 968.

^c Gen. x. 25.

^d Authent. Rec. p. 1045,

1046, 1047.

this probably in the Days of *Osymandes*, the Astronomical King of *Thebes*, and that at a Time, when not only *Egypt* was peopled, and inhabited as far South as *Thebes*, and the Kingdom of *Thebes* had been for some Successions settled, but was become very populous, as appears by *Diodorus Siculus*. Now how this can agree to an Interval after the Deluge of hardly 200 Years, which the *Masorete* Chronology alone gives us, 'tis hard to say: While it perfectly agrees to the larger Interval of almost 800 Years, which the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, the *Septuagint Version*, and *Josepbus* afford us.

(6) The true Account of *Manetho's* ^a *Dynasties*, extending backward 3555 Years before *Alexander the Great*, and taking their rise from *Vulcan*, before the Deluge the very same Year with *Alorus*, the first King of *Babylon*, is in the short Chronology, very soon after the *Mosaick* Creation it self; and long before any Kingdoms could be founded in *Egypt* or any other Country: While that Creation is in the larger Chronology 356 Years after the Creation. 'Tis therefore undeniable that these genuine *Dynasties* of *Manetho*, do strongly contradict the Shorter, and confirm the Longer ^b Chronology. The same Conclusion is also most agreeable to the 330 Statues of the ancient *Egyptian* Kings: tho' many of them be supposed Collateral and Contemporary one with another. Yet does the uncertainty we are here sometimes left in, how many and how long these different *Dynasties* continued Collateral and Contemporary render any nicer Determination by this Character at present utterly impracticable.

(7) The State of the Kingdom of the Shepherds in the lower *Egypt*, 511 Years older than ^c *Teth-*

^a *Essay on the O. T. Append. p. 189.—195. Authent. Rec. p. 1042.*

^b *Essay p. 222. Rec. p. 1041.*

^c *See my Chronological Table and Essay on the O. T. Append. p. 182,—188.*

mosis or *Amosis* in *Manetho*, and which conquer'd *Timaus*, an earlier King of that lower *Egypt*, and the last of whose Kings had 240000 of those Shepherds shut up in *Abaris* and *Pelusium*, and besieged by no fewer than 480000 *Egyptian* Soldiers under *Amosis* or *Tethmosis*, is a farther Demonstration on the Side of that longer Chronology. *Timaus* being in that Chronology about 500 Years after the Deluge; whereas in the shorter he must have been immediately after it; when yet Mankind were much too few to make any Kingdom at all. Nor could 511 Years afford such a multiplication of Mankind, as the two Armies, the one of 240000, and the other of 480000 imply.

(8) The famous *Laterculus* ^a of *Eratoſthenes*, containing the Series of the Kings of *Thebes* from *Menes* or *Mestram*, till near his own Time, for about 2100 Years, which is about 2350 Years before the Christian *Æra*, just at the Deluge in the shorter Chronology, and 500 Years after it in the longer, suffers us not to doubt which of those Chronologies best agrees to the ancient Records that *Eratoſthenes* followed in this his *Laterculus*.

(9) The precise Number of 1903 Years, during which *Callisthenes* ^b found Astronomical Observations at *Babylon*, when *Alexander* the Great took it, 330½ Years before the Christian *Æra*; which is within 116 Years after the Flood in the shorter Chronology, but about 700 Years after it in the longer; is another sure Chronological Character that the former cannot be the true one, but the latter only.

(10) The beginning of the *Assyrian* Kingdom at *Babylon* under *Belus*, ^c the Head of the *Egyptian*

^a *Essay on the O. T. Append.* p. 196. *Authent. Rec.* p. 976, 977. and *Chronological Table.*

^b *Authentic Rec.* p. 1048. *Marsh.*

Chron. p. 107.

^c *Authent. Rec.* p. 977, 978. and *Chronolog.*

Table.

Astronomers, was about 1050 Years before the Siege of *Troy*; which Siege was itself about 1180 Years before the Christian *Æra*. Whence the Origin of the *Affyrian* Kingdom was about 2230 Years before the Christian *Æra*; hardly 120 Years after the Deluge in the shorter Chronology; but 700 Years after it in the larger, which latter therefore alone could afford Men enough since the Deluge, to compose that Kingdom; nor could the Country of *Sicyon* in *Greece*, which became a Kingdom between one and two Centuries later, be supposed to have People enough for such a Kingdom at a Place so remote ^a according to any other than the larger Chronology.

(11) An ancient Inscription at *Thebes*, seen by *Cæsar Germanicus*, ^b and belonging to *Rhamses*, or *Ramestes* the Great, the Grandfather of *Sesofstris* the Great, inform us, that this King had an Army of 700000 Men, and reigned over *Libya*, *Ethiopia*, *Media*, *Persia*, *Bactria*, *Scythia*, *Armenia*, *Cappadocia*, *Bitbunia*, and *Lycia*. So that at this time, all these Countries were peopled; and *Egypt*, with its Confederates were so full of People, as to afford that vast Army of 700,000 Men. Yet is this but about 800 Years after the Deluge, in the *Masorete* Chronology; but near 1300 Years in the Chronology of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, of the *Septuagint* Version, and *Josephus*. I need not say to which Chronology these vast Numbers of People then in the World do best agree; the Thing speaks for itself, and needs not any Commentary of mine to enforce it. And since these vast Conquests of *Ramestes* are fully confirmed by the Inscription on his famous Obelisk, set down in my *Essay on the Old Testament* ^c, from *Ammianus Marcellinus*, I look upon this Argument as really unanswerable.

^a *Authent. Rec.* p. 982.
235. p. 217 — 220.

^b *Essay on the O. T. Append.* p. 234,

(12) However, The History of *Sesostris* the Great, the Grandson of that *Ramestes*; who himself conquered as far as *China*, and, according to the ancient Records transcribed by *Josepbus*, having no fewer in his Army, raised almost at a Days Warning, just before he perished in the *Red-Sea*: ^a than 200,000 Foot and 50,000 Horse, is a strong additional Confirmation of the Multitude of People in the World, and particularly in *Egypt*, in the Days of *Moses*, which, without Dispute, is another very great Confirmation of the larger Chronology, and joined to the foregoing, renders it still more certain and undeniable.

P R O P O S I T I O N V.

THE earliest Eclipses that appear to have been foretold among Mankind, are those two Eclipses of the Sun, which, with an Earthquake, are prophesied of by *Amos*, as Signals of the approaching Captivity of the Ten Tribes by the *Assyrians*.

Hear the Words of the Prophet *Amos*, who prophesied in the Days of *Uzziah*, King of Judah; and in the Days of *Jeroboam*, the Son of *Joash* King of Israel, two Years before the Earthquake ^b. Of which Earthquake we have mention also made in that Part of *Zachariah* which was written by *Jeremiah*. *Ye shall flee, as ye fled from before the Earthquake, in the Days of Uzziah King of Judah* ^c. The Words of *Amos* are these: *The Lord hath sworn by the Excellency of Jacob; surely I will never forget any of their works* ^d: [the wicked works of the ten Tribes:] *Shall not the Earth tremble for this? [with an Earthquake?] and every one mourn that dwell therein? and its Con-*

^a *Essay on the O. T. Append.* p. 139 — 162. ^b *Amos* i. 1.

^c *Zach.* xiv. 5. See *Essay on the O. T.* p. 93, 94, 95. ^d *Amos* viii. 7, 8, 9, 10.

summation, [or compleat Destruction,] shall utterly rise up, as a Flood; and it shall be rejected and drowned, as by the River of Egypt: [as the lower Egypt is every Year totally overflowed by the Nile.] And it shall come to pass in that Day, [perhaps soon after that Earthquake,] saith the Lord God, that I will cause the Sun to go down at noon; and I will darken the Earth in the clear Day: [by bringing on Eclipses of the Sun] And I will turn your Feasts into Mourning, and all your Songs into Lamentation. And I will bring up Sackcloth upon all Loins, and Baldness upon every Head, And I will make it as the Mourning of an only Son; and the End thereof as a bitter Day. Hear also the Words of Tobit, relating to Part of this very Prophecy: — I ate my Meat in Heaviness, says Tobit ^a at Nineveh, in the Jewish Feast of Pentecost, Remembering that Prophecy of Amos, as he said, Your Feasts shall be turned into Mourning, and all your Mirth into Lamentation.

P R O P O S I T I O N VI.

THE next Eclipses, both of the Sun and Moon, together with the Occultation of the *Hyades*, and an Earthquake, are those foretold by *Isaiab*, as Signals of the Conquest of the *Babylonians* by the *Medes*.

Hear the Words of *Isaiab*; when about 60 Years after *Amos* had foretold his Eclipses and Earthquake, he prophesied thus, ^b as to the Overthrow of the *Babylonians* by the *Medes*. *Behold the Day of the Lord cometh; cruel, both with Wrath and fierce Anger; to lay the Earth desolate: And he shall destroy the Sinners out of it. For the Stars of Heaven, [even] the Kefilim thereof, [the Constellation called the Hyades] shall not give their light: The Sun shall be*

^a Tobit ii. 5, 6.

^b If. xiii. 1. 17. 19. v. 9. — 13.

darkened in his going out: [his rising or setting.] And the Moon shall not cause her Light to shine. And I will punish the World for their Evil; and the Wicked for their Iniquity: And I will cause the Arrogancy of the Proud to cease; and I will lay low the Haughtiness of the Terrible. I will make a Man, [Cyrus, twice elsewhere named by this Prophet,] more precious than fine Gold; even a Man than the golden Wedge of Ophir. Therefore I will shake the Heavens, and the Earth shall remove out of her Place; in the Wrath of the Lord of Hosts, and in the Day of his fierce Anger.

N. B. The Arabian and Jewish old Constellations mentioned in the Books of *Job*, *Amos*, *Isaiah*, and *Kings*, are these; according to my Exposition.

(1) The crooked Serpent *Job* xxvi. 13. *Is.* xxvii. 1. may possibly be our *Draco*, the crooked Dragon. but this is very uncertain.

(2) *Kimah*, *Job*. ix. 9. xxxviii. 31. *Amos* v. 8. The *Pleiades* or *Seven Stars*; on the Back of *Taurus*.

(3) *Kesil* *Job* ix. 9. xxxviii. 31. *Amos* v. 8. The *Bull's Eye*; and *Kesilim*, in the plural, the *Hyades*, on the Face of *Taurus*. *Is.* xiii. 10.

(4) *Hash*, and his Sons. *Job* ix. 9. xxxviii. 32. Part at least, of the large and principal Constellation of *Orion*; with some neighbouring Stars.

(5) *Mazaroth*, or *Mazuloth* *Job* xxxviii. 32. 2 *Kings* xxiii. 5. The great *Dog Star*, or *Syrius*, the *Egyptian Idol* or *God*: The *Canicular Period* of 1460 Years among the *Egyptians* was taken from the Revolution of this Star through all the Days of the Year. The *Jews* understand by this *Mazaroth*, the twelve Signs of the *Zodiack*. N. B. Whether *Leviathan* in *Job* iii. 8. and *Is.* xxvii. i. be not a Constellation, and one of the *Serpents* may be questioned.

^a *Is.* xlv. 28. xlv. 1.

(6) The

(6) *The Secret Chambers of the South*, Job ix. 9. seem no other than those *Southern Constellations* that were not visible in *Arabia*.

P R O P O S I T I O N VII.

THE next Eclipse of the Sun, with an Intimation of an Earthquake, is that foretold by *Jeremiah*, and now extant in *Zachariah*, about 125 Years after the foregoing Predictions of *Isaiab*: It relates, I think, to the Passion of the *Messiah*, and to the Miseries of the *Jews* by *Titus Vespasian*. The Words are these,

** Ye shall flee [from another Earthquake,] like as ye fled from before the Earthquake in the Days of Uzziah, King of Judah. And the Lord my God shall come, and all the holy ones with him. And it shall come to pass in that Day, [the Day of the Earthquake, perhaps,] that the Light shall not be clear nor dark: But it shall be one Day, which shall be known to the Lord, not Day nor Night: But it shall come to pass, that at Evening-time it shall be light.*

That truly great Man, A. Bp. *Ussher* gave me the first Occasion of more distinctly considering these Eclipses. Take therefore his Account in his own Words, out of his excellent *Annals*, at the 791st Year before the Christian *Æra*. “ There was, says “ the A. B. an Eclipse of the Sun of about ten Di- “ gits *June 24* in the 791st Year before the Chri- “ stian *Æra*, in the Feast of *Pentecost*. Another “ of almost twelve Digits, twenty Years afterward, “ in the 771st Year, on *November 8th*, during “ the Feast of *Tabernacles*. And a third, of “ more than eleven Digits, the following Year, “ the 770th, upon *May 5*, in the Feast of un- “ leavened Bread. It deserves then to be confi- “ dered, whether it be not to these Eclipses that

^a *Zach. xiv. 5, 6, 7.*

“ the Prophecy of *Amos* viii. 8, 9, 10, does belong?
 “ *It shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord*
 “ *God, that I will cause the Sun to go down at Noon;*
 “ *and I will darken the Earth in the clear Day: I*
 “ *will turn your Feasts into Mourning, and all your*
 “ *Songs into Lamentation.* Which Words, as the
 “ Christian Fathers accommodated, in an allegori-
 “ cal Sense, to that Darkness which happened at
 “ the Feast of the Passover, at the time of our
 “ Lord’s Passion, so is there no Reason to refuse
 “ their Completion in the literal Sense; as fore-
 “ telling the Obscuration of the Day by these
 “ three great Eclipses, in those three Festivals,
 “ wherein all the Males were obliged to appear at
 “ *Jerusalem* before the Lord. That as *Thales* did
 “ first of all among the *Greeks* foretell an Eclipse
 “ of the Sun, (See afterwards, in the *Annals* at the
 “ Year 601) from the Science of Astronomy; so
 “ does *Amos* seem first to have foretold such
 “ Eclipses among the *Hebrews*, by the Revelation
 “ of the holy Spirit.” So far the Archbishop.

Take the Calculations of these three Eclipses,
 briefly as follows, for the Meridian of *Jerusalem*:
 Allowance being also made for the odd 20" in 18
 Years or 223 Months, by Dr. *Halley*’s small Dimi-
 nution of the Moon’s Period, or Sir *Isaac New-*
ton’s small Retardation of the Earth’s diurnal Mo-
 tion in that Proportion; of which already. This in-
 fers the earlier coming of Eclipses, about 47’ in
 140 Periods, which have revolv’d since the Days
 of *Amos*.

☉ Eclipsed June, A. D. 791.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Gem.	24	15
Years								
back-	}	700	11	19	42	35	☾ Gem.	29 45
wards.								
+		80	5	23	40	52	diff.	5 30
+		11	0	10	14	17	Mean	
							Time	24 16 16
		—	5	23	37	44	June.	
								47
		—	1	0	31	58	+	24 15 29
								2 28
+	June	1	10	48	11		=	24 17 57
		—	2	11	20	9	—	11 36
	Rest	9	18	39	51		=	24 6 21
d	23 (24)	9	10	23	13	D's Lat. North.		
(by the Leap-day.)						Node Ascend.		
b	16		8	15	38	Annular.		
			8	7	38			
16			8	0				

N. B. The Middle of this Eclipse happened at *Samaria*, the Capital of the Ten Tribes, after Sun-setting; and never before arrived at ten Digits.

© Eclipsed Nov. A. D. 771.

<i>A. D.</i>	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Scorp.	9	24
Years back- wards.	}	700	11	19	42	35	☽ Scorp.	13 33
		60	1	10	15	36	diff.	4 9
+		11	10	14	17	Mean Time } Nov.	8	9 18
+		1	10	12	31			
								47
=		5	13	57	11	=	8	8 31
+ Nov.		3	15	59	16	+	2	28
=		8	29	56	27	=	8	10 59
Rest		3	0	3	33	-	9	18
d	7 (8)	2	25	20	7	=	8	1 41
b	9	+	4	43	26	☽'s Lat. North	30'	
			4	34	18	Node Descend.		
	18			9	8	Annular.		

N. B. The middle of this Eclipse happened at Samaria a little before two a Clock in the Afternoon; and the Digits eclipsed there were hardly more than 7.

Of which is more correct.

☉ Eclipsed May, A. 770.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Taur.	5	42
Years back- ward.	700 11 19 42 35					☾ Aries	29	35
+	60	1	10	15	39	Diff.	6	17
+	10	8	0	36	53	Mean Time May	4	13 42
-		9	0	35	7			
=		9	23	34	35	-		47
+	May		22	53	23	=	4	12 55
=	10		16	27	58	+		2 28
Rest	1		13	32	2	=	4	15 23
d 3 (4)	1		6	34	20	+		10 53
			6	57	42	=	5	2 16
b 13			6	36	12	☾'s Lat. North	3'	
			21	30		Node Ascend.		
42						Just Total.		

N. B. The Middle of this Eclipse happened at *Samaria* three Quarters after Two in the Afternoon nearly; and the Digits there were about $11 \frac{1}{2}$.

N. B. The supernatural Eclipse at the Passion of *Jesus of Nazareth*, began at Noon, and lasted till Three o'Clock in the Afternoon in *Judæa*; as the Gospels inform us*. Nor did *Plutarch's* and *Aurelius Victor's* Total Eclipse of the Sun, which appears to be also supernatural, considerably differ from it. Of which, see more hereafter.

* Matt. xxvii. 45. Mar. xv. 33. Luc. xxiii. 44.

As to the Eclipses, Occultation of the Stars, and the Earthquake foretold by *Isaiab*, as above, we must Note, that his Prediction was delivered about 120 Years before any Part of it was fulfilled; that it contained four several *Signals*, that were to precede the Overthrow of the *Babylonian* Empire by the *Medes*, and three of them remarkable *Phænomena of Astronomy*; the fulfilling of which may be thoroughly examined at this Day, Certain *Eclipses*, or as we now call them, *Occultations* of the Stars, called *Hyades* [by the Moon:] A great *Eclipse of the Sun*, with the peculiar Circumstance of Time at the *going out of the Sun*, which I take here for *Sun-setting*; as it seems to signify *Gen. xix. 23.* compared with *v. 15, 16, 26.* A great *Eclipse of the Moon* to follow it; together with a great *Earthquake*, to affect both the Earth and the Air, or *Heavens* thereto belonging. Now for the three Astronomical *Phænomena*, the *Occultation of the Hyades*; and the two *Eclipses*, they certainly came to pass according to these Predictions; as will appear from the following Calculations.

Place of $\odot$'s Ascend.	}	8	28	36	4	
Node A. D. 1.		8	28	36	4	
Motion back-ward in Years.	}	500	10	10	36	23
		+ 80	3	17	21	2
		+ 4	2	17	22	3
		+ days 218	11	35	51	
Place of the Node	}	1	25	51	23	
the 585th Year.		1	25	51	23	
+ Præcess. Æquinox	}	1	1	21	40	
A. D. 1689 exeunte.		1	1	21	40	
Place of the Ascend.	}	2	27	13	3	
Node from the Equinox then.		2	27	13	3	

From which Place of the ascending Node, at the Day of the great Eclipse, *May 28 A^o. 585.* every Celestial Globe will readily shew the Position of the *Hyades*, with relation to the Moon's Orbit, as directly disposed for their *Occultation by the Moon*. And we easily learn thence, that from the Year 590 to the Year 585 before the Christian *Æra*, both inclusive; or during six Years, at Intervals of Periodical Months, there were perpetual *Occultations of the Hyades* by the Moon. As we had the like Occultations of the *Pleiades* in the Year 1730, and of the more Southern *Hyades* in the Years 1718, 1719, 1720, concerning which last, Dr. *Halley* published an Advertisement in *The Philosophical Transactions* for 1717. N^o 354. As for the two Eclipses here also foretold by *Isaiah*, take their Calculations as follows.

☉ Eclipsed May A. D. 585.

A. D.	1.	6	24	9	42	☉ Taur.	28	45
Years back- ward.	500	3	5	30	25	☾ Taur.	27	0
+	80	5	23	40	52	diff.	1	45
+	5	10	0	18	27	Mean	d	h
						Time	28	2 10
		6	29	29	44	May		
		11	24	39	58		0	43
+	May		22	53	23		28	1 27
			17	33	21			2 28
							28	3 55
								2 55
							28	6 50
d	28		11	11	20	☾'s Lat. North.	13'	
b	2			1	6	Node Ascend.		
					1			
	10			5	15	Total.		

N. B. We hence learn that May 28th in the 585th Year before the Christian *Æra*, about Seven o'Clock at Night, by the Meridian of *Jerusalem*, the Shadow of a *Total Eclipse of the Sun* passed through the *Babylonian Empire*, till *Sun-setting*.

☾'s Eclipse

5's Eclipse *May, A. D. 584.*

A. D.		1	6	24	9	42	☉ Taur.	5	25		
Years back- ward.	}	500	3	5	30	25	☾ Scorp.	10	0		
		+	80	5	23	40	52	diff.	4	35	
		+	4	5	20	41	3	Mean Time May	3	16	37
		—	2	19	52	20					
=		4 4 17 22					—	43			
+ May		22 53 23					=	3 15 54			
=		4 27 10 45					+	2 28			
							=	3 18 22			
Ref.		1	2	49	15		—	9 17			
a	2 (3)		24	22	53		=	3 9 5			
			8	26	22	☾ Lat.	North 11'				
b	16		8	7	38	Duration of the Eclipse					
	37			18	44	3 ^h 45'					
							Duration of Total				
							Darkness 1 ^h 45'				
							Node Ascend.				

N.B. We hence learn that in eleven Months and an half after the former Eclipse of the Sun, or May 3d A^o 584 at Night, there was a very Great and *Total Eclipse of the Moon*: beginning, by the same *Jerusalem* Meridian, about Seven o'Clock; lasting three Hours and three Quarters: Total for an Hour and three Quarters, and visible through the intire *Babylonian* Empire.

N. B. These three *Astronomical Characters* have not only been exactly accomplished, but accomplished in the very same *Order* wherein they lie in the Prophecy. I mean so, that the
Occultation

Occultation of the Hyades came first, then the *Eclipse of the Sun*; and in the third Place the *Eclipse of the Moon*.

As to the fourth and last Signal in this Prediction, that of the *Earthquake*, I cannot give any direct Account of its Accomplishment, for want of *Affyrian* or *Babylonian* Memoirs of those Ages. So far only we may Note, that *Pliny* says, ^a Earthquakes are sometimes caused by Eclipses of the Sun and Moon: as if there were Traditions among them that they had been sometimes observed soon after such Eclipses. As also we may Note, that in the very Age of these Eclipses before us ^b, *Pherecydes* the Syrian, (or as *Eusebius* says, *Pythagoras* himself, *Præp. Evang.* x. 2.) is said to have foretold an *Earthquake*; and that it was to happen distinctly the *third Day* after his Prediction, Whether he did it, as *Pliny* and *Diogenes Laertius* say, ^c by *tasting the Water drawn out of a Well*: Or, whether it were not rather derived ultimately from this Prophecy of *Isaiah*, I shall not positively determine. This only I shall add, that as *Pliny* acknowledges this Prediction to have been of a *divine Sort*; so has no Body, I suppose, been able by the other Way, of *tasting Water drawn out of a Well*, to foretell any one such *Earthquake*, either before or since the Days of *Pherecydes* and *Pythagoras*.

As to the *Eclipse* foretold, and the *Earthquake* intimated at the Passion of the *Messiah*, by *Jeremiah* the Prophet, it seems to me, upon the joint Consideration of this Prediction, with the Prediction of *Amos* first set down, the one written a little before, and the other

^a *Nat. Hist.* II. 80. ^b *Diog. Laert. in Pherecydes.* ^c *Plin. c. 79.*

long after the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, that God foretold by these two Prophets two parallel Captivities of the Jews; the one of the Ten Tribes by *Salmanassar*, &c. the other of the Two Tribes by *Titus Vespasian*; and also foretold two parallel Signals or Forewarnings to each of those parallel Desolations and Captivities: I mean *Earthquakes* and *Eclipses of the Sun*: which latter were in those Days very terrible to Mankind as well as the former: that the particular *κεκτημενα* or Characteristicks of these Eclipses of the Sun, (taking both the parallel Prophecies together, to explain and illustrate one another) should be these three; that they should be all visible in *Judæa*: that they should begin about, or not long after Noon: and that, accordingly, they should be all over, and the Sun recover its Light before the Evening. To which may be added a *fourth* very uncommon Characteristick, that they should be accompanied with Earthquakes about the same Time. Nay, a *fifth* Characteristick be added, that they were to be at, or soon after some of the great *Jewish* Festivals. The Calculation of the Eclipses foretold by *Amos* I have already produced: while the Eclipse at the *Passion*, and that parallel one in *Plutarch* and *Aurelius Victor* were *supernatural*; and so not capable at present of any Calculation, of which more hereafter. I proceed therefore to the

O B S E R V A T I O N S.

I. I Observe, that this particular Prophecy of *Amos*, concerning the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, is better attested to as genuine and authentic than most others in the intire *Old Testament*: it being cited, as we have seen, by *Tobit* himself; one

one of those Ten Tribes then in *Affyria*, upon whom this Prophecy of their Captivity had been already fulfilled: one that was so far contemporary with the Prophet *Amos*, that when he was young he might easily have heard him Prophecy: and one who yet lived above 500 Years before we find any Eclipse to have been foretold by the Rules of Astronomy.

II. I observe, that the Prophecies of *Amos*, dated *two Years before the Earthquake*, and both in the Reigns of *Uzziah* and *Jeroboam*, appear to have been delivered in the 36th or 37th Year of the Reign of *Uzziah*; and in the last, that is, the 52d or 53d Year of the Reign of *Jeroboam*. Nor, as I think, can any other Time be assigned in Correspondence to all the Characters here concerned. This was the 773d Year before the Christian *Æra*; two Years before the Eclipses foretold by *Amos*; as we shall see presently; and, by Consequence, almost as much before that great *Earthquake*, which seems very little to have preceded one of them.

III. I observe, that A. Bp. *Usher's* Hypothesis of an ancient *Jewish Solar Year*; upon which alone the fixing his Eclipses exactly at the three *Jewish* Festivals depends; seems to me utterly indefensible: and that from the *Luni-solar Year*, which I think that Nation has ever used, at least since the Days of *Moses*, such Eclipses must have fallen a Fortnight after the beginning of two of those Festivals, which always fell at the full Moon; or a Week after the end of the Feasts of the Tabernacles and of the Passover; which lasted each a full Week; and 22 Days after the Feast of *Pentecost*, which lasted but one Day.

IV. I observe, that the first of these three Eclipses mentioned by the Archbishop, ought to be intirely out of the Question, when we speak of the fulfilling of *Amos's* Prophecy. Not only because it was 20 Years earlier than the other two; but be-

cause its Circumstances no way agree with theirs. It did not begin *at or near Noon*: Nor in the clear Day: Nor was there any *Light* in *Judea* in the Evening, after it was over: Nor indeed do I well know by what Tables of Astronomy the Archbishop could find this Eclipse as of 10 Digits in *Judea*: while the exacter Tables that I make use of, give us its very *Middle*, which was greatly *West* from that Country, late in the Evening, by the Meridian of *Jerusalem*: and give us Sun-setting a good while before the Middle of the Eclipse there: as appears in its Calculation. And indeed this first Eclipse seems to me to have happened not *after*, but 18 or 19 Years *before* the Delivery of this Prophecy of *Amos*: and so it could not be a Completion of that Prophecy.

V. I observe, that altho' the second of these three Eclipses might be *after* the Prophecy was delivered, and was at the same Time of the Day here determined, and so might be hinted at therein; yet since the Quantity was little or nothing more than 7 Digits at *Samaria*, while the next was above 11 Digits, or almost Total there; I take this latter to be the *principal* Eclipse here meant. 'Tis true, the A. Bp's Quantity of the foregoing Eclipse, in all the Copies I have seen, is *almost* 12 Digits, or almost Total: *i. e.* greater than that of the third, which he only affirms to be more than 11 Digits. Yet since I find this to be an entire Mistake, I cannot insist upon it.

VI. I observe, that the same Descriptions and Characters of *Eclipses* agree to this last now before us, concerning the Captivity of the ten Tribes foretold by *Amos*, and to that before the Captivity of the two Tribes foretold by *Jeremiah*: as every Astronomer will easily observe. They both were visible in *Judea*; they both began *about*, or *not long after Noon*. Accordingly both their Eclipses were over, and the Sun recovered its Light *before the Evening*;

Evening; in both Cases they were accompanied by *Earthquakes*, and they both happened at or near the great *Jewish Festival of the Passover*: to say nothing here of both their equal Distance before those several Judgments of which they appear to have been the *Prophetick Signals*; as we shall see presently. See much the like Circumstances in *Plutarch's* and *Aurelius Victor's* supernatural Eclipse hereafter.

VII. I observe, that *Jeremiab* farther secures us, he meant Times long future, and the *Days of the Messiah* in this his Prophecy, by those other remarkable Words concerning the same Time; *The Lord my God SHALL COME, and all the Holy Ones with Him*^a; which can belong to no Days so well as to the *Days of the Messiah*. Accordingly, 'tis well known, that our Saviour and his Disciples denoted his Execution of his Vengeance on the *Jews* and on *Jerusalem*, here foretold, by the peculiar Language of his COMING, very often in the *New Testament*. *Matt. xvi. 28. xxiv. 42, &c. Mar. viii. 39. xiii. 35. Luc. xxi. 31. Job. xxi. 22, 23. Heb. x. 37. Jam. v. 9.* Nor does it seem to me improbable, that the Language of our Saviour, as applied to the Destruction of the *Jewish State*, by the Power of the *Messiah*, is particularly taken from this very Prophecy of *Jeremiab* before us.

VIII. I observe, that the Phrase here used by *Jeremiab* of the COMING of the *Lord his God*, and all his *Holy Ones with Him*, to assist and encourage the *Roman Armies* at the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, is exactly agreeable to the *Jewish* Notions and Language elsewhere upon the like Occasions. Of which we have a pertinent Example just before, in the same Prophet, *Then shall the Lord Go FORTH, and fight among these Nations, as when he fought in the Day of Battle*^b; or as when he was Captain of

^a Zach. xiv. 5.

^b Zach. xiv. 3.

the Lord's Host, in the Days of Joshua^a: Of which also we have another not less remarkable Instance in the Epistle of Baruch to the 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ Tribes, a few Years since published by me in English^b, relating to the parallel Destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. I do now let you know, my Brethren; says Baruch, that when our Enemies besieged the City, the Angels of the most High were sent, and they destroyed the Forts of our strongest Walls, and overturned those iron Angles of our Fortifications which could not [otherwise] have been plucked up.

IX. I observe, that *Josephus*; who, as I have already shewn, had a Copy of the Old Testament beyond compare better than ours; ascribes that surprising prophetick Description of an Earthquake at Jerusalem by *Jeremiab^c*, which precedes the Passage already set down, viz. That *The Feet of the Lord shall stand upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the East; and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof, towards the East, and towards the West: and there shall be a very great Valley: and half of the Mountain shall remove towards the North, and half of it towards the South*: He ascribes, I say, this Description, or at least a Parallel one then extant in the History of the *Old Testament*, and that as literally true, to the Earthquake under *Uzziab*; and supposes it to have happened at that very Time that *Uzziab* usurped the Priest's Office, and was smitten with Leprosy. All which, if true, renders that Earthquake still more remarkable; and implies that the latter Situation of the Valley of *Jebosaphat*, and of the Mountains on the *North, East, and South* of Jerusalem, must have been greatly altered by that Earthquake.

^a Josh. v. 13, 14, 15.
vi. 18.

^c Zach. xiv. 4.

^b Antiq. x. 10. & ap. Euseb. Demonstr.

X. I observe, that the same *Josepbus*, from his better Copy of the *Old Testaments*, or other ancient Records^a, farther secures us of the *Parallelism* of the Earthquake and Eclipses in the Days of *Uzziab*, with those at our Saviour's Passion, by informing us; that, as we know from the Gospel History the *Veil of the Temple was rent*^b at the latter, so was *the Temple itself rent*^c at the former Earthquake; ^das also that the Rays of the Sun penetrated through that Rent or Fissure, and fell upon *Uzziab's Face*; and, as it were, struck him with a Blast, and produced a *Leprosy upon his Forehead*^e, which lasted till the Day of his Death^f.

XI. I observe, that there was moreover another Sort of *Parallelism* of Circumstances, at the two Destructions of *Jerusalem* by *Nebuchadnezzar* and by *Titus*; I mean the Burning of the Temple or City at both Times on the same tenth Day of the same fifth Month *Ab*^g; as *Josepbus* truly observes; and as the constant annual Fast of the whole Jewish Nation for both those Destructions on the same Day: of Old on the Tenth^h; but of late on the Ninth of the same Month *Ab* demonstrates. And, what is here not a little remarkable, and what I have also noted elsewhere, is this, that the Apostles themselves, or at least their Amanuensis, *Clement of Rome*, in the Constitutions; as it were by way of Prediction, take Notice of the same Resemblance, in these Wordsⁱ: Even now, on the tenth Day of the Month *Gorpiazus*, [or *Ab*.] “when the
“*Jews* assemble together, they read the Lamen-
“tations of *Jeremiah*; in which it is said, *The Spi-*
“*rit before our Face, Christ the Lord, was taken in*
“*their Destructions*. And *Baruch*; in whom it is
“written, *This is our God: No other shall be esteemed*

^a *Ibid.* ^b *Matt.* xxvii. 51. ^c *Mar.* xv. 38. ^d *Luc.* xxiii. 45.
^e *2 King* xv. 5. ^f *2 Chr.* xxvi. 21. ^g *De Bello.* vi. 8. ^h *Prim.*
Christ, revived. Vol. III. p. 191, 192. ⁱ *Constitut.* c. v. 20.

“with him: He found out every Way of Knowledge,
 “and shewed it to Jacob his Son, and Israel his be-
 “loved. Afterwards he was seen upon Earth, and
 “conversed with Men. And when they read them
 “they lament and bewail, as themselves suppose,
 “that Desolation which happened by *Nebuchad-*
 “*nezzar*: but, as the Truth shews, they unwilling-
 “ly make a Prelude to that Lamentation which
 “will overtake them hereafter,” [by *Titus Vespas-*
 “*ian*.]

XII. I observe, that besides this more occasional Remark, the Apostles, or *Clement*, do, in the same Work expressly apply this Prediction of an Eclipse by *Jeremiah* to the particular supernatural Eclipse of the Sun at our Saviour's Passion, in these Words, already produced in my *Phlegon*, p. 6.
 “Then was there Darkness for three Hours, from
 “the Sixth to the Ninth^a: and again Light in the
 “Evening: as it is written, *It shall not be Day*
 “*nor Night, and at the Evening there shall be*
 “*Light*^b.”

N.B. I always call the Eclipse of the Sun at our Saviour's Passion, a supernatural One: as not caused by the Interposition of the Moon; and that for two substantial Reasons: I mean that Christ was crucified at the Jewish Passover, which was always at the full Moon; while all natural Eclipses of the Sun are at the new: and that it continued for three Hours, whereas no Eclipse of the Sun by the Moon can last so long.

XIII. Besides the three Captivities and Destructions of the two Tribes by *Nebuchadnezzar*, by *Astaxerxes Mnemon*, and by *Titus Vespasian*, there was a fourth, little inferior to any of the rest, under the Emperor *Adrian* A. D. 135. wherein, as the Jews

^a *Constitut.* v. 14. ^b See *Euseb. Demonstr.* vi. 18. and x. p. 487.

themselves say, as many perished as came out of *Egypt* = 600000^a; and by other Accounts no fewer than 480000, till the Nation with their spurious Messiah *Barbocab*, was in a manner cut off. Now, if we look backward, as in the Destruction by *Titus*, almost 37½ Years, we shall come to the former Part of A. D. 98. when on *Jan. 27 Nerva* the Emperor died; and the very same Day there was an Eclipse of the Sun; as *Aurelius Victor* informs us. This Eclipse must have been like that at our Saviour's Passion, a supernatural One; for the Astronomical Tables afford none. Nor have we, I think, an additional Author inferior to *Phlegon* for this Prodigy: I mean *Plutarch*, whose Eclipse I formerly observed, abating the Age, did look extremely like *Phlegon's*^b. And no Wonder; since it is highly probable that it was no other than a parallel Eclipse to it; and a Signal of parallel Judgments on the same two Tribes. *Plutarch* might write the Treatise wherein this Eclipse is mentioned about A. D. 100, or soon afterward. So his Observation that it had lately happened, exactly agrees to this time of the Death of *Nerva*, and of that Eclipse of the Sun which accompanied it.

XIV. I observe, that it is plain in the Place already quoted out of *Josephus* that *Uzziab's* Offering Incense was at one of the great Jewish Festivals. And 'tis equally plain, that if the Earthquake was between a Week and Fortnight before the third or greatest Eclipse of the Sun, that Earthquake was at the principal Jewish Festival, the Passover. As it is certain that both the Earthquake and Eclipse at our Saviour's Passion were at the same principal Feast at the Passover also.

XV. I observe, that in this Interpretation, the Order of the Events, as foretold by *Amos*, that first the Earthquake, and after it the great Eclipse

^a *Vid. Calvisium ad A. T. 135.*

^b *Phlegon. p. 39.*

of the Sun should come, is the same in which those Events came to pass, of which we have already had more eminent Instances in *Isaiab*.

XVI. I observe, that *Jeremiab* having, in the Text already set down, hinted at the *parallel Earthquake*, and directly foretold the *parallel Eclipse*, in the Days of the *Messiah*, assures us, that it should be but *One* remarkable *Day*: perhaps in Contradistinction to the two several remarkable *Days* of the two *Eclipses* now before us, on *November 8th.* and *May 5th.* Or else to the *two* several *Days* on which the Correspondent *Earthquake* and *Eclipse* happened in the Days of *Uzziab*: whereas both the *Earthquake* and the *Eclipse* in the Days of the *Messiah* were to be on *one and the same* most remarkable *Day*, on which the *Messiah* himself was to suffer.

XVII. I observe, that if the Dread Mankind was anciently in at great *Eclipses*, either of the Sun or Moon, be considered, we shall not want an Interpreter to those Words of the Prophet *Amos*, which follow the Prediction of this *Eclipse* already set down, even by way of Prelude to their final Accomplishment, during the long Continuance of the Captivity of the ten Tribes afterwards: as *A. Bp. Usher* expounds them, viz. that even then *God turned their Feasts into Mourning; and all their Songs into Lamentation.* For since not only the smaller *Eclipse November 8th.* happened in less than a Week's Time after the eight Days of the Feast of Tabernacles; but the great *Eclipse* itself *May 5th.* following, fell out just a Week after the Feast of the Passover; the melancholy View of these *Eclipses*, especially as they were now become Signals of the approaching Captivity of the ten Tribes, and as joined with a terrible *Earthquake*, must naturally turn such their so lately celebrated *Feasts into Mourning; and their so lately resounding sacred Songs into Lamentation.*

XVIII. The

XVIII. The great Eclipse of the Sun foretold by *Isaiab*, and already described, was, I suppose, that very Eclipse which is principally famous in Antiquity, the first that was foretold among the *Greeks*, I mean by *Thales*. The Story is well known from *Herodotus* and others^a; that the Sight of this Total Eclipse of the Sun so affrighted the *Lydians* and *Medes*, who were just then fighting one against another in a Kind of *Nocturnal Battle*; to use the Words of *Herodotus* concerning this War in General; that it brought the two Nations to mutual Peace and Amity. And strange it is, that so great a Man as A. Bp. *Usher* should fix this Battle to the Year 601, instead of 585. while he owns that the Eclipse of the Sun that Year, at the Place of Battle, was no more than *nine Digits*, whereas *Herodotus* says, the *Day* thereby *became Night*: which implies a Total Eclipse: as this before us *A^o 585* most certainly was.

XIX. I observe, that the *parallel* Signals of *parallel* Judgments to the ten Tribes and to the two Tribes; and the latter both as to their first Captivity by *Nebuchadnezzar*; and their second by *Artaxerxes Mnemon*: and their third by *Titus Vespasian*, and their fourth by *Adrian*, were seen about the very same time before the Judgments themselves respectively, I mean about 38 Years perpetually. Before I come to state this Interval, I must give the Reader the Calculations for the Days of *Nebuchadnezzar*, and *Artaxerxes Longimanus*.

^a See the *Lectures de Eclips. Antiq.* p. 402, 403.

☉ Eclipsed Feb. A. 635.

A. D.	1.	6	24	9	42	☉	Aquar.	15	30
Years back- ward.	600	1	12	36	30	☾	Aquar.	18	0
+	20	4	13	25	13		diff.	2	30
+	15	6	0	55	18	Mean	d	h	'
						Time	12	1	31
		11	26	57	1	Feb.			
									44
=		6	27	12	24	=	12	0	47
+ Feb.	0	17	54	47		+		2	28
=		7	15	7	11	=	12	3	15
						-		5	20
Rest	4	14	52	49					
d 11 (12)	4	14	5	53	=		11	21	55
			46	6	☾'s Lat.	North.	37		
b 1			30	29	Node Ascend.				
' 31			15	57	Annular.				

☉ Eclipsed

☉ Eclipsed June A. 437.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Gem.	13	40
Years back-wards.	400					☽ Gem.	19	35
+	20	4	13	25	13	diff.	5	35
+	17	3	2	21	35	Mean Time	10	14 24
—		14	11	8	June.			
							40	
=		6	9	58	34	=	10	13 44
+ June		1	10	48	11	+		2 28
=		7	20	46	45	=	10	16 12
							+	11 0
Rest		4	9	13	15	=	10	05 12
d 10		4	1	54	27			
			7	18	48			
b 14			7	6	41	☽'s Lat. North	8'	
						Node Ascend.		
' 24				12	7	Total.		

Thus those elder Eclipses, visible in *Judæa*, foretold by *Amos*, were very little, if at all, before the first lesser Attempt of the *Assyrians* under *Pul*: they were about 30 Years before the more considerable Captivity of the two Tribes and a half beyond *Jordan* by *Tiglath—Pul—Assar*: and about 50 Years before their final grand Captivity by *Salman Assar*, And the mean of these Numbers is 40. Thus the great Eclipse of the Sun, visible in *Judæa*, in the Year 635 was about 29 Years before the first *Babylonish* Captivity of the two Tribes under *Jeboiakim*: a little above 36 Years before the second *Babylonish* Captivity under *Jeboiachin*: and about 47 Years before the taking of *Jerusalem* and burning the City.

City and Temple by the *Babylonians* under *Zedekiah*: and the mean of these Numbers is $37 \frac{1}{3}$ Years. Thus the Eclipse in the Year 437 was about 38 Years before the second or *Persian* Captivity of the two Tribes: Of which, see the *Authentic Records* pag. 49, 50, 51. Thus it's well known that the supernatural Eclipse and Earthquake at our Saviour's Passion were almost $37 \frac{1}{2}$ Years before the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and third Captivity of the two Tribes, I mean that by *Titus Vespasian* and the *Romans*. Thus also we have seen that the supernatural Eclipse mentioned by *Plutarch* and *Aurelius Victor*, was just at the same Distance before the miserable Destruction of the *Jews* by *Adrian*. Thus also if we include a like Correspondence in the famous Eclipse of the Sun foretold by *Isaiah*, as a Signal of the Overthrow of the *Babylonians* by the *Medes* 25 Years before *Cyrus* began his Expedition against them: and 47 Years before he took *Babylon*: the mean of these Numbers is 36 Years, the Proportions will stand thus in Order 40. 38. $37 \frac{1}{3}$. $37 \frac{1}{2}$. $37 \frac{1}{3}$. 36. in the exactest Correspondence to each other. Now that such a regular Correspondence of great Eclipses of the Sun, all visible in *Judæa*, and almost at the very same Distances previous to the Captivity of the ten Tribes into *Assyria*; to the Destruction of the *Assyrians* or *Babylonians* by the *Medes* and *Persians*; to the four Captivities or Destructions of the two Tribes, the first by the *Babylonians*, the second by the *Persians*; and the third and fourth by the *Romans*; and that at such remote Distances of Place, and Intervals of Time respectively, should be all by *Chance*, and without *Design*, is plainly incredible. And if that be incredible, this Correspondence can be no other than either

either directly Prophetical, or at least intirely Providential.

XX. I observe, that altho' there be this Difference between the Eclipses foretold by *Amos*, *Isaiab*, and that foretold by *Jeremiab*; or between those that were seen before the Captivity of the ten Tribes, or those that were seen before the Conquest of the *Babylonian* Empire by the *Medes*; and between those two seen before the two Destructions of *Jerusalem* and Captivities of the two Tribes by the *Romans*; that the former were *natural*, and the two last *supernatural* ones, yet, as the *Earthquakes* in both Cases seem to have been equally *supernatural*; so was it almost as impossible for *Amos* and *Isaiab*, especially for *Amos*,^a an *Herdsmen* of *Tekoa*, a Town at the Edge of the great *Southern* Desert, and a *Gatherer of Sycamore Fruit*; two of the meanest Employments in Life; and this in the ancient Days of *Uzziab* and *Hezekiab*; without supernatural Revelation to have so accurately foretold those *natural* Eclipses, as if they had been really themselves *supernatural*. These Predictions being made in the Infancy of Astronomy, when the general Causes and Seasons of such Eclipses were little known: and above 500 Years before any Astronomical Tables or Periods of Eclipses are heard of among Mankind.

XXI. I observe, that since these Denunciations of *Isaiab* were made with Regard to the *Babylonians*, who in those Days were the greatest *Astronomers*, or rather *Astrologers* in the World: (I say rather *Astrologers* than *Astronomers*: for both their and the *Egyptian* Sciences of this Nature served them to little other Uses than to make them, in the Words of *Isaiab*,^b *Astrologers*, *Star-gazers*, and *monthly Prognosticators*.) These *Astronomical* Signals, in particular that of the *Occultation* of the *Hyades* by the

^a *Amos* vii. 14.

^b *Is.* xlvii. 13.

Moon, was peculiarly proper for *their* Consideration. And had this been made use of to most other Nations, it would have been both useless and unintelligible to them.

XXII. I observe, that 'tis no way improbable that *Thales* himself, who had been among the *Egyptian* Astronomers, as *Diogenes Laertius* assures us; and that about the same time that the remnant of the two Tribes, with *Jeremiah* the Prophet, were in *Egypt*; among which Tribes the Prophet *Isaiah* had about 120 Years before foretold the very same Eclipse also; learned that Prediction of this Eclipse, and the very Year to which it belonged from the *Jews* there; or from such of the *Egyptians* as had learned it from them already. ^a *Plutarch* and *Eusebius* ^b informs us, that this *Thales* was the very first who knew that Eclipses of the Sun were derived from the Interposition of the Moon: which is but the bare first elementary Notion of such Eclipses. Nor was it at all *probable*, I had almost said *possible*, that the same *Thales* should *begin* and *perfect* so intricate a Theory as is that of Solar Eclipses, for particular Countries and Places; especially seeing so much later as the first Year of the *Peloponnesian* War, so great a Man at *Athens* as *Thucydides*, giving an Account of a great Eclipse of the Sun then seen, says only *it seems doxai impossible to be at any other time than at the New Moon*. *Diodorus* also particularly informs us, ^c that the *Babylonian* College of *Astronomers*, which originally went out of *Egypt*, could not *foretel* Eclipses of the Sun by Astronomy. And when he celebrates the *Theban* *Egyptians* as originally the most skilful in such Sciences, he tells us, ^d that "They seemed very exact in observing the Eclipses of the Sun," (of which Eclipses *Diogenes Laertius*, as we have seen,

^a De Placit. Philos. C. xxiv. ^b Præp. Evang. xv. 50. ^c II. 31. ^d I. 50.

reckons up 832 of the Moon, and 373 of the Sun as visible, and recorded by the *Egyptians*^a) and from those Eclipses “did by way of Divination with “ great Certainty foretell particular Events.” Yet does he not say a Word of their Ability to foretell them by the Rules of Astronomy. And since it is certain, that no other very ancient Eclipse is pretended to have been foretold by any *Babylonian*, *Egyptian*, or *Grecian* but that single one which I suppose the Prophet *Isaiab* had foretold long before; and that when Eclipses are foretold by Astronomy, 'tis not done barely to a Year, which only appears in this Case, but to a Day and an Hour, if not nearer; and that this Eclipse itself was 400 Years earlier than any Periods or Tables of Astronomy appear to have been invented for this Purpose; it is most natural to conclude, that this Prediction of *Tbales* was taken, not from such Periods or Tables of Astronomy, but from this ancients Prediction of the Prophet *Isaiab*.

N. B. I believe I may here justly use the Words of our great Astronomer Dr. *Halley* concerning *Comets*; ^b and may safely apply them to *Eclipses* also. “ The old *Egyptians* and *Chaldeans*, says he, if we may believe *Diodorus Siculus*^c, had such a long Series of Observations [of Comets and Eclipses] before them, “ that they could foretell when Comets would “ appear, [and Eclipses happen.] But when “ they are said by the same Arts to have “ foreseen Earthquakes, and the Weather, “ [with the private Fortunes of Men,] there “ is no Doubt to be made but their Skill in “ these Things was rather owing to their judicial Astrology, than to any Astronomical “ Theory of their Motions. Nor was there

^a Procem.

^b Cometograph. ap. Prælect. Physico-Mathemat.

^c 336, 337. ^e Diodor. II. 30.

“ any considerable Knowledge of that Kind
 “ found among them by the *Greeks*, who con-
 “ quered both those Nations. Infomuch,
 “ that we ought to confess that the Astrono-
 “ my we have now advanced to so great an
 “ Height, is owing to the *Greeks*; especially
 “ to the great *Hipparchus*, as the Inven-
 “ ters.”

XXIII. I observe, that as the Downfall of the
 first, *i. e.* of the *Assyrian* or *Babylonian* Monarchy,
 with the several Captivities of the ten, and of the
 two Tribes of *Israel*, were foretold by *Amos*,
Isaiab, and *Jeremiab*, as having both frightful
 Eclipses, and sometimes terrible Earthquakes also,
 as *Signals* of their approach; and all still about 38
Years before-hand, which we have already seen: So
 do we find that both the *partial* and the *total*
 Downfalls or Destructions of every one of the four
 Monarchies, the *Assyrian* or *Babylonian*, the *Medo-*
persian, the *Grecian*, and the *Roman*, were ushered
 in, and sometimes in part occasioned by the like
 Eclipses *immediately before-hand*: Sometimes in a
 natural, and sometimes in a supernatural Way. And
 so that the intermediate *Breaches* made upon the
 several Empires were constantly introduced by
 great Eclipses of the Sun: and their final Periods by
 great Eclipses of the Moon, still visible over the
 same Monarchies: as the following Calculations
 will demonstrate.

(1) Thus a little before the miraculous Slaughter
 of the 185000 *Assyrians* before *Jerusalem*, in the
 Days of *Hezekiab*, *A° 710.* upon which the *Medes*
 immediately revolted under *Deioces*, *A° 709.* which
 was the first grand Breach upon the *Assyrian* Mon-
 archy; there was a Total Eclipse of the Sun, March
 15 *A° 711.* a little after Noon, at the Meridian of
Niniveb: whose total Shadow passed over that in-
 tire Monarchy, as will appear by the following Cal-
 culation.

© Eclipsed

(249)

☉ Eclipsed *March*, *A°* 711.

<i>A. D.</i>	1	6	24	9	42	☉	<i>Pisc.</i>	14	45'	
Years										
back-	}	700	11	19	42	35	☾	<i>Pisc.</i>	13	20
ward.										
+		11	0	10	14	17	diff.		1	25
							Mean	}		
		11	29	56	52		Time		^d	^h
							<i>March</i>		13	20
=		6	24	12	50					
+ <i>March</i>		11	29	15	14					
=		6	23	28	4					
							+ Diff. Me-			
<i>Rest.</i>		5	6	31	56		rid. <i>Green-</i>	}		
<i>d</i> 12 (13)		4	26	17	20		<i>wich and</i>			
			10	14	36		<i>Niniveh.</i>		3	0
			10	9	32		=		13	22
<i>h</i> 20				5	4		+			25
<i>i</i> 10							=		14	0
										49
							☾'s Lat.		<i>North</i>	41
							Node Ascend.			
							Total for several			
							Minutes.			

(2) Thus a little before the second *grand Breach* upon the same Monarchy, by the Destruction of *Niniveh*, its Metropolis, *A°* 612. there was a *Total Eclipse of the Sun* that Year, *April* 28 in the Morning by the same Meridian, when the Sun seems to have risen Eclipsed almost through that whole Empire: as the following Calculation will demonstrate.

I i.

☉ Eclipsed

(250)

☉ Eclipsed April, A°. 612.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Aries	29	53
Years back-ward.	600	1	12	56	30	☽ Aries	26	20
+	12	5	2	3	7	Diff.	3	33
—	6	14	39	37	Mean Time } April	28	8	14
=			9	30	5	—		44
+ April 0			17	10	2	=	28	7 30
=			26	40	7	+		3 0
Rest	11	3	19	53		=	28	10 30
d 27 (28)	10	29	9	0		+		6 30
		4	10	53	☽'s Lat. North	=	28	17 0
b 8		4	3	49	Node Descend.			
14			7	4	Total for several Minutes.			

(3) Thus just before or during the last Siege of Babylon by Cyrus, the Persian, (by whose Success in it the first or Babylonian Monarchy was put an End to A°. 539:) there was a Total and almost Central Eclipse of the Moon, visible over all the Babylonian Empire, between the 25th and 26th of June A° 540 about Midnight: whose Calculation is as follows.

☽'s Eclipse

☾'s Eclipse June, A. 540.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Gem.	25	45
Years	_____							
back-ward.	500	3	5	30	25	☾ Gem.	25	45
+	40	8	26	50	26	diff.	0	0
—	0	2	20	51	Mean Time	} 25 9 28		
					June.			
=	6	21	48	51	—			43
+ June	1	10	48	11	=	25	8	45
=	8	2	37	2	+ Diff. Merid. Greenwich and Babylon.	} 3 14		
Rest	9	27	22	58				
d	24 (25)	9	22	34	40	=	25	11 59
		4	48	18	☾'s Lat. North.			6
b	9		4	34	18	Node Ascend.		
	28			14	0			

(4) Thus *Herodotus* informs us, that just before the first *grand Breach* in the *Persian Monarchy*, by the prodigious Defeat of *Xerxes* in *Greece*, in the 480th Year before the Christian *Æra*, there was indeed a very great and *Total*; but, as appears by the *Astronomical Tables*, a *supernatural Eclipse of the Sun*, seen by him and his whole Army at *Abydus*. This strange Prodigy, notwithstanding the *Magi* or *Astrologers* flattered *Xerxes* that it foreboded Good to the *Persians*, and Evil to the *Grecians*, did so far affect *Pitbius*, a great Man of *Lydia*, who with all his five Sons were then in the Army with *Xerxes*, that he begged of him, that the eldest Son might be dismissed for the Security of his Family; which Request *Xerxes* took with such Indignation, that he commanded that eldest Son to be divided into two Parts, and those Parts to be placed on each

Side of the Road, that his Army might march between them: which was done accordingly: and is a terrible *Memorial* of the Reality of the supernatural Eclipse of the Sun at that Time. But this Eclipse, whether directly miraculous; or only greatly providential, by the Interposition of a Comet; does not come under any of our present Calculations.

(5) Thus *Pliny, Plutarch, Arrianus, Ptolemy*, and *Quintus Curtius* take Notice, that about eleven Days before the last Defeat of the *Persian* Monarch *Darius*, by *Alexander* the Great, *A. 331.* there was a *Total Eclipse of the Moon*, seen by *Alexander* and his whole Army; and that it made a great Impression upon them, and by some was supposed to portend the following Victory: which put an End to the *Medo-Persian*, or second Monarchy. This Eclipse was that Year, *September 20th* at Night; according to the following Calculation.

☾'s Eclipse *September, A. 331.*

A. D.	i.	6	24	9	42	☉ Virg.	22	15
Years						☾ Pisc.	25	20
back-	300	6	21	18	15	diff.	3	5
wards.						Mean		
+	20	4	13	25	13	Time	20	13
+	11		10	14	17	Sept.		26
								39
		11	14	57	45	=	20	12
						+	3	14
		7	9	11	57	=	20	16
+	Sept.	2	22	21	7	-	5	26
		10	1	33	4	=	20	10
								35
Rest		7	28	26	56	☾'s Lat.	20	North
d 19 (20)		7	21	37	27	Node Descend		
			6	49	29	Total.		
b 13			6	36	12			
' 26				13	17			

(6) Thus

(6) Thus there was a great *Eclipse of the Sun*, A^o 247. Sept. 7. between two and three a Clock in the Afternoon, by the Meridian of *Parthia*, and visible over all the Northern Parts of *Asia*. About or just after which Eclipse happened the Defection of all the eastern Dominions from the Yoke of the *Seleucidae*: When they set up the great *Parthian* Empire under the *Arfacidae*: Which was, by far, the greatest intermediate *Breach* upon the third or *Grecian* Monarchy. Take the Calculation of this Eclipse as follows.

☉ Eclipse Sept. A^o. 247.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Virg.	9	25
Years						☽ Virg.	11	40
back-ward.	200	8	14	12	10	Diff.	2	15
	+40	8	26	50	26	Mean		
	+7	6	19	33	14	Time	7	1 51
						Sept.		
		0	0	35	50			37
		6	23	33	52	+Diff. Me-	7	1 14
+ Sept.		2	22	21	7	rid. Green-		
		9	15	54	59	wich and		4 30
						Parthia.		
Rest		2	14	5	1			7 5 44
d 6 (7)		2	13	8	40			4 10
				56	21			7 1 34
h 1				30	29	☽ Perigee fere.		
' 51				25	52	Total for several		
						Minutes.		
						☽'s Lat. North	76	
						Node Descend.		

N. B. Altho' this Defection of *Arfaces*, and by consequence the Erection of the *Parthian* Empire under him, be, by *Trogus Pompeius*, and by *Moses Chorenensis*, ascrib'd to the Consuls
 Vulso

Vulso and *Regulus*; or to the Year 250; yet does the *Persian Mercondus* put it only 72 Years after the Death of *Alexander* the Great, or to the Year 251. and *Eusebius* to the cxxxiii Olympiad, or to Part of 247 and 248. Nay, both *Justin* and *Appianus* say it was not till the Reign of *Seleucus*, or not before the Year 246. So that this eminent Eclipse of the Sun might probably enough a little precede the solemn Commencement of the *Parthian* Empire. Nor need we suppose these seeming different Accounts to be quite opposite to each other: Since so great a Revolution might well be above three Years from its first rise till it was perfectly compleated. See *A. B. Usher's Annals*, at the Year 250.

(7) Thus also *Polybius*, *Pliny*, *Plutarch*, *Livy*, and *Justin*, take Notice of a *Total Eclipse of the Moon*, the very Night before the concluding Battle between *Perseus*, the last King of *Macedon*, and *Paulus Æmilius* the Roman Consul and General, A° 168. and that this Eclipse was not only a *Signal*, but one direct *Occasion* of the following Victory. And this Eclipse is the most remarkable, because it had so great a Share in finally destroying the Original or *Macedonian* Branch of the *Grecian* or third Monarchy. It is also still more remarkable because it was the first that was, at least publicly, foretold by a *Roman*, *Suspicius Gallus*. Take its Calculation as follows.

Eclipse June A° 168.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42
Years					
back-					
wards.					
	100	10	7	6	5
+	60	1	10	15	39
+	8	11	11	22	5
	10	28	43	49	
		7	25	25	53
+ June		1	10	48	11
=		9	6	14	4
Rest		8	23	45	56
d 21		8	16	0	20
			7	45	36
b 15			7	37	9
' 16				8	27

☉ Gem.	26	15
☽ Sagit.	29	30
Diff.	3	15
Mean		
Time	21	15 16
June.		
		35
	21	14 41
+ Diff. Me-		
rid. Green-		
wich and	1	30
Thessalo-		
nica.		
	21	16 11
		7 16
	21	8 55
☽'s Lat North	12	
Duration of the		
whole Eclipse	III	$\frac{1}{4}$
Hours.		
Durat. of the Total		
Darkness	I	$\frac{1}{4}$ Hour.
Node Ascend.		

(8) Thus also there was a *Total, and almost central Eclipse of the Moon*, A° 63. Octob. 27. about 7 at Night, by the Meridian of *Jerusalem*, visible in all *Asia*; soon after *Syria* was reduc'd into a *Roman Province* A° 64. which Eclipse was also just after the Birth of *Augustus*. Take its Calculation as follows.

(☽'s Eclipse

J's Eclipse Octob. A° 63.

A. D.	1	6	24	9	42	☉ Scorp.	0	43
Years						☽ Aries	27	30
back-						Diff.	3	15
ward.						Mean		
	60	1	10	15	39	Time	26	23 53
	+	3		28	52	Octob.		
								33
								26 23 20
						+	Diff. Me-	
							rid. Green-	
							wich and Je-	2 28
							rusalem.	
								27 1 48
								0 6 0
								27 7 48
						J's Lat.	North	5'
						Node Ascend.	Total and almost cen-	
							tral.	

N. B. When this Syrian Kingdom, which was a Branch of the third or Grecian Monarchy, was exactly ruined by the Romans is not agreed among the ancient Historians. Nor indeed can I affirm that the Reduction of the poor Remains of the Syrian Kingdom into a Roman Province, and the Conquest of Mithridates by Pompey, with his Death A° 64. can be justly esteemed the Fall of that Kingdom. Only this Eclipse being a very great one, and this Year having some Pretence to be that Period, I have set its Calculation down: Tho' the Eclipse falling a little *after*, and not *before* the Event, contrary to the other Examples, I lay no stress upon it. However,

(9) Thus

(9) There was a very great Eclipse of the Moon A° . 30. Jan. 30. It was visible in *Ægypt* before Sunrising; when the Moon set totally Eclipsed there; and this only six Months before the Death of *Cleopatra*, the last Queen of *Ægypt*; and the very last Remains of the Third or *Grecian* Monarchy. Take its Calculation as follows :

☾'s Eclipse January A° . 30.

<i>A. D.</i>	1	^s 6	^o 24	'9	"42	☉ Aquar.	^o 7	'15
Years						☾ Leo	7	20
back-	}	20	4	13	25	13		
ward.		10	8	0	36	53	diff.	5
		0	14	2	6	Mean		
		6	10	7	36	Time	}	29 16 48
		Jan.	0	0	0	Jan.		33
								15
Rest	11	19	52	24	+	Diff. Merid.		
<i>d</i> 28 (29)	11	11	20	27	Greenwich and	}	2	12
					Alexandria.			
		8	31	57			29	18 27
<i>b</i> 16		8	7	38				12
' 48		24	19				29	18 15
							☾'s Lat. North 1°.	
							Total; and in a man-	
							ner central.	
							Node Ascend.	

(10) Thus there appears to have been a *total Eclipse of the Sun* a little before the first great Stoppage of the Progress, and Breach upon the Majesty of the fourth or *Roman Empire*, by the Death of *Augustus*, about *July* or *August*, A.D. 14. as both *Dio* and *Eusebius* or *Jerom* inform us; tho' the *Astronomical Tables* allowing of no such *natural Eclipse* of the Moon, we are forced to suppose it *supernatural*, or made without the Moon. However, it being impossible at present to compute this Eclipse, I proceed to the next.

(11) Thus there was a *total Eclipse of the Sun*, before the *grand Breach* or *Dissolution* of the old united State of the same fourth or *Roman Monarchy*, by the Conquest and Expulsion of *Momyllus Augustulus*, the last Shadow of a Successor to the great *Augustus*. For a few Months before that his Conquest and Expulsion, on *June 7th*, A.D. 476. towards Evening, there was a *total Eclipse of the Sun*, whose shadow passed over the intire length of the *Roman Empire* from *Scotland* to *Euphrates*; and whose Center went off the Earth about the Meridian of *Rome*, or the Middle of that Empire. Here follows the Calculation :

☉ Eclipse June, A.D. 476.

A.D. 1	6 ^s 24 ^o	9 ['] 42 ["]	☉ Gem.	19 ^o 0 [']
Years 400	4 28	24 20	☾ Gem.	24 30
+ 60	1 10	15 39	diff.	5 30
+ 15	6 0	55 18	Mean Time June } 7 15 36	
+ June	1 10	48 11		
=	8 14	33 10		
Rest	3 15	26 50	—	24
d 8 (7)	3 7	31 33	= 7	15 12
	7 55	17	+ Diff. Merid. Greenwich and Rome. } 54	
b 15	7 37	9		
' 36	18 8			
			= 7	16 6
			—	10 30
			= 7	5 36
			☾'s Lat. North	30'
			Node Ascend.	
			Total.	

(12) Thus, lastly, we have two *total and almost central Eclipses of the Moon* that will be visible over all the *Roman Empire*, in the Year 1736. The *first*, *March 15*, before Midnight. The *second*, *September 9*, about 3 a-Clock in the Morning. Now it is well known, by those who have been conversant in the *Revelation of St. John*, and its latest Expositors, that this 1736 is the very Year when the famous 1260 Days or Years of the Continuance of the over-bearing Tyranny of the last Ten Kingdoms of the *Roman Empire* with the greatest Probability are to be at an End, as I have largely shewed elsewhere. *Lit. Accompl. of Propb.* page 93—113. The Calculations follow:

☾ Eclipse, *March* A.D. 1736.

A.D. 1721.	^s	^o	[']	["]	☉ Aries	^o	[']
Years 15,	5	8	1	1	☾ Libra	6	32
<i>March.</i>	6	0	55	18	diff.	7	32
	11	29	15	14		1	0
					Mean	} ^d ^h	[']
	= 11	8	11	33	Time		
					<i>March</i>	15	13 18
Rest	6	21	48	27	—		1 40
d 16 (15)	6	15	3	7	= 15	11	38
		6	45	20			
b 13.		6	36	12	☾'s Lat. North 3',		
' 18.			9	8	Node Ascend.		
					Total and almost		
					Central.		

☾'s Eclipse, *September*, A.D. 1736.

A.D. 1721.	^s	^o	[']	["]	☉ Virg.	^o	[']
Years 15,	5	8	1	1	☾ Pisces	27	36
<i>September.</i>	6	0	55	18	diff.	29	17
	2	22	21	7		1	41
					Mean	} ^d ^h	[']
	= 2	1	17	26	Time		
					<i>Septem.</i>	15	13 18
Rest	3	28	42	34	—		3 10
d 9 (8)	3	19	43	0	= 8	14	32
		8	59	34			
b 17		8	38	6	☾'s Lat. South 3',		
' 42			21	28	Node Descend.		
					Total and almost		
					Central.		

N. B.

N. B. Since there will be an Annular Eclipse of the Sun on *February* the 18th *A. D.* 173 $\frac{6}{7}$ of about 10 Digits at *London*, and whose Center will pass nearly from *North* of *Dublin* to *Edenburgh*, with a Ring of Light round the Moon all the Way : which Path of the Center is very nearly the utmost *Western* Limit of the *Roman* Empire, and whose partial Shadow will extend over the *Roman* Empire, as far as *Euphrates*; of which see my eight Eclipses drawn on the Map of *Europe*: We may with the old *Romans* begin the Year with *March*, and take this Eclipse into our Consideration also: which if we do, we shall find that in the same Year 1736, there will be seen in one Place or other no fewer than five Eclipses of the Sun, on *March* the first, and *March* 30. On *Aug.* 25. On *Sept.* 23, and *Feb.* 18. besides the two great Eclipses of the Moon just now calculated, seven in all, which is a greater Number of Eclipses than I have ever met with in any of those 72 Years for which I have computed them. Nay, if we take in but five Days farther in *March* 1737, we shall have, somewhere or other, no fewer than eight such Eclipses, five of the Sun and three of the Moon. There will also be a very small Eclipse of the Sun, or a Transit of *Mercury* over the Sun, the same Year *Octob.* 31^d 10^h 53' *mane* and visible over all the *Roman* Empire also. Which Number of Eclipses cannot but render this Year exceeding remarkable to Astronomers: that Number of Eclipses having hardly ever been equalled; to be sure never exceeded in any one Year since the Creation.

N. B. It will also here deserve our Notice, that on *March* 21, *A. D.* 1764. the very Year when there is some Reason to expect the
Jewish

Jewish Temple described by *Ezekiel* will be Dedicated at *Jerusalem*, *Authent. Rec.* p. 463, 464. and only two Years before the Commencement of the seventh *Millenium* since the Creation, according to the *Samaritan Chronology*, of which there also, will be in the Afternoon in all the *South-East* and *East Parts* of *England*, one of the greatest and most curious *Annular Eclipses* of the Sun that was ever seen, passing near *London* and *Lisbon*, and lasting in all about 2^h 56' there. See my eight Eclipses drawn on the Map of *Europe*.

N.B. It appears, that the last great Eclipse of the Moon 1736, on *September 9*, is, to a few Weeks if not nearer, 1260 *Julian Years* from the Deposition of *Augustulus*.

N.B. As to any Astronomical or other Signals, before our Saviour's *second coming*, I do not design to treat of them in this Place: but shall refer the inquisitive Reader to my *Lit. Accompl. of Proph.* p. 83 — 87. and to my *Authent. Rec.* p. 84 — 88.

N.B. That such a regular Correspondence of Eclipses, *Total Eclipses of the Sun*, just before the *grand Breaches* upon every one of the four Monarchies: and those all visible through those Monarchies: as also that such a regular Correspondence of Eclipses *Total Eclipses of the Moon* just before the *Ends* of every one of the same four Monarchies, and those all visible through those Monarchies, should be all by *Chance* and *without Design*, is plainly *incredible*. And if that be *incredible*, this Correspondence can be no other than directly *supernatural* and *providential*. Known unto God are all his Works from the beginning of the World. *Acts xv. 18.*

XXIII. I observe, that the Prophet *Ezekiel* gives us a particular *Signal* which was to precede or accompany *Nebuchadnezzar's* Conquest of *Egypt* about the Year before Christ 570. It may not therefore be amiss to set down this Prediction, and to consider how different it is from those we have been discoursing of; tho' at the first Sight it has some Resemblance to them. **When I shall extinguish Thee*, [O Pharaoh Hophra,] says God by this Prophet, *I will cover the Heaven, and make the Stars thereof dark: I will cover the Sun with a Cloud, and the Moon shall not give Light. All the Lights of the Light of Heaven will I make dark over Thee; and set Darknefs upon thy Land, saith the Lord God.* Here we have a Prediction, not of any *Occultations* of particular Stars, or of distinct *Eclipses* either of the *Sun* or *Moon*; but of a general Scene of very uncommon *Clouds* and *Darknefs*: which were Things little known in *Egypt*: where they had^b less Rain, and by Consequence fewer Clouds than any other known Country in the World. On which Account this strange *Darknefs* was a Signal peculiarly proper for the *Egyptians*: as the like or greater *thick Darknefs* which might be felt^c, had been one of the ten Plagues with which this Nation was smitten in the Days of *Moses*. Accordingly, this Description is not only of the darkening of *all* the heavenly Bodies, Sun, Moon, and Stars in general; which is a Thing quite remote from particular *Occultations* and *Eclipses*, and can only be effected by Clouds or Mists: but the principal Part of the Darknefs, that of the Sun, is here expressly said to be *by a Cloud*, which sufficiently shews the great Difference between the former *Occultations* and *Eclipses* and this Darknefs. I only wish, that we had as certain a Way of knowing exactly when and where this

* Ezek. xxxiii. 7, 8.
Diodor. I. 41.

^b Herodot. II. 13, 14, 25. III. 10.
^c Ex. x. 21, 22, 23.

Prediction of *gross Darknefs* over *Egypt* was fulfilled, as we have already produced for the fulfilling of those other Predictions which concerned Occultations and Eclipses. But I am afraid our Want of *Egyptian* Records of that Age renders such an Expectation at present next to impossible.

N. B. I always call those *four* Eclipses of the Sun when *Xerxes* was passing into *Greece*; when *Augustus* died; when our Saviour was crucified; and that mentioned by *Aurelius Victor* and *Plutarch*, &c. *supernatural Eclipses*: meaning no more thereby, than that they were not caused by the Interposition of the Moon; the only ordinary, and so the *most natural* Cause of such Eclipses, tho' perhaps they were not, in the highest Sense, *miraculous*, or produced by the immediate Power of God: but might be derived from the Interposition of Comets: as has been already explained, provided withal the divine Providence did originally adjust the Orbits and Motions of those Comets so, that at certain proper Times, and on certain important Occasions, they should interpose between the Sun and the Earth, and cause such *prodigiously uncommon*, and *highly providential*, tho' not *strictly miraculous* Eclipses of the Sun. Of which sort of Causes, See my *New Theory* at large, Edit. 4. *Solut.* II. and LXXXVIII.

XXIV. I observe, that *Virgil*, *Lucan*, *Seneca*, and ^a*Pliny*, when they describe a great Darknefs or *Eclipse of the Sun*; tho' not when they describe an *Eclipse of the Moon*; all add to that Description an *Earthquake* also: as ^b*Grotius* takes Notice concerning the three first mentioned. Which Events not having, in the ordinary Way, any natural Connection; their so frequently connecting them together may well be derived from the Coincidence

^a Plin. II. 80.

^b Grot. in Matt. xxvii. 51.

of them both in several of the old Prophecies, and in their Completions, already mentioned.

N. B. Since *Cicero* assures us, by the Mouth of *Cato major*, in his Book *De Senectute*, that
 “ *Sulpicius Gallus* was one that almost killed
 “ himself in measuring both the Heaven and
 “ the Earth: that he would sit Night and
 “ Day at such Studies: and that *Scipio* was
 “ greatly delighted to hear him foretell E-
 “ clipses, both of the Sun and Moon, a great
 “ while beforehand”: It seems to me highly
 probable, that he was the very first Inventer of
 Astronomical Tables; or rather of *Pliny*’s
 and *Ptolemy*’s famous Cycle of 223 Months,
i. e. 18 Years, 7 Hours and 43 $\frac{1}{2}$ Minutes;
 the Period of corresponding Eclipses; by either
 of which Methods the Eclipses of the Sun
 and Moon are, within a certain latitude, at
 all Times discoverable. We never find any
 one of the *Ancients*, but a *Roman*, *Pliny*, who
 mentions that Cycle so early: [I say *so early*
 only: for *Ptolemy* mentions it also afterwards,
 from those he calls the *old Mathematicians*:
 which will easily reach as far backward as
Sulpicius Gallus, near 200 Years before the
 Christian *Æra* ^b] *Pliny* also mentions it a little
 after he had been giving us an Account of
 this *Sulpicius Gallus*’s Skill in foretelling such
 Eclipses. And since *Gallus* appears first of all
 to have determined them nearer than to a
 Year; he seems to have been the very first
 that could foretel them by any Periods or
 Rules of Astronomy. As for the *Greeks*, they
 never seem to have been able to foretell any
 other Eclipse than that of *Thales*, till *Hippar-
 chus* made his Astronomical Tables of the Sun
 and Moon, for 600 Years^c: which yet were

^b *Almag.* IV. 2. pag. Edit. Græc. 83.

^c *Plin.* II. 12.

not finished till about 50 Years after Eclipses were foretold by *Gallus*: If this *Gallus's Volume*, mentioned by *Pliny*, as by him published concerning the Doctrine of Eclipses, were now extant, we should know more of such Matters. But alas! *Non licet Astronomis adeo esse beatis!* In the mean Time, so far appears that *Gallus* foretold the Time of his first publick Eclipse of the Moon, nearer than the bare Period of 223 Months could guide him: tho' his determining its Duration to no more than *two Hours*, when it must, by Calculation, have lasted *above three*, shews a considerable Imperfection in that Determination: as if such Determination was not then brought to any Degree of Perfection. However, the Prediction of Eclipses was then so new and strange a Thing among the *Romans*, who yet were perpetually reading the *Greek Books*, that this *Gallus* was by them admired for it, in the Words of *Livy*, as a Person of *little less than divine Wisdom*: which seems to me to imply, that neither the *Greeks* nor the *Romans* could foretell Eclipses by any Rules of Astronomy before his Time. [See the original Words of all the ancient Authors concerning Eclipses in my *Lectures on those ancient Eclipses*, subjoined of late to my *Prælect. Physico-Mathemat.* p. 308 — 435.]

XXV. *Amos* therefore, *Isaiab*, and *Jeremiab*; whose Predictions of such future Events as in their Days were no Way discoverable by natural Knowledge, and which were exactly fulfilled in their proper Seasons, were for certain, *true Prophets*: and those future Events were, for certain, discovered to them by *supernatural Revelation*.

XXVI. *Jesus of Nazareth* therefore, under whom was exactly fulfilled that Prophecy of *Jeremiab*, as to the *supernatural Eclipse of the Sun*, and the
Earth-

Earthquake at his Passion, in all their Circumstances, was himself a *true Prophet* sent by God: and is accordingly no other than that *Lord God* who *was to come* and *has come*^a into the World, in the Name of his Father: who *was to come* and *has come* with all his *holy Ones* at the Head of the *Roman Armies* for the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and Captivity of the *Jews*, who caused him to be crucified. He is also no other than that *Messiah*, who is *still to come*, and *will come* to *restore again the Kingdom to Israel*, and at last, ^bto *judge both the quick and the dead*, at his *appearing and his Kingdom*.

^a Zach. xiv. 5.^b Act. i. 6, 7. 3 Tim. iv. 1.

Decemb. 5, 1733.

WILL. WHISTON.

A P P E N D I X III.

A SHORT VIEW of Sir ISAAC NEWTON's Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John.

SINCE the Christian World is now at last in possession of the great Sir *Isaac Newton's* free Thoughts and *Observations*; or, of the Result of his diligent Enquiries into no small Parts of the Prophecies of *Daniel*, and of *St. John*, with certain other occasional Discoveries; since these *Observations* are ever made in a grave, sober, and serious Manner, upon difficult Points of the highest Consequence to revealed Religion; since they are honestly directed, as well for the Discovery of Truth, as for the Support of the Authority of those sacred Writings which Sir *Isaac Newton* always firmly believed to be true; for the Correction of modern anti-christian Errors, both in Faith and Practice, which he always detested; and for the Restoration of sincere and uncorrupt Christianity, as it was at first settled by the Apostles from *Christ*, and received and practised by the primitive Churches, which he always admired; since these *Observations* were written, and are published at a Time when many Pamphlets against the sacred Writings and against Christianity, swarm among us; and this by a Layman, that had no particular Obligations upon him to follow such sacred Studies; and at a Time when even some of the most learned of the Clergy, under those Obligations divert their Studies from the Bible
to

to prophane Authors ; and others of them, instead of attending to the Duties of their Holy Function in their own Diocesess or Parishes, immerse themselves in secular Affairs, in political Factions, and in heaping up Preferments on themselves, their Relations and Dependents, like Men abandoned to this *present evil World* ; since this Exposition of Scripture Prophecies is given us by much the greatest Mathematician and Philosopher that ever was ; altho' he could not but know, that the Study of Prophecies is, among the polite World, generally in a low, or rather in an ill esteem ; and that he must sacrifice no small Part of his vast Reputation with very many by leaving these Papers to be printed ; And since, in order to his own Satisfaction, he has been obliged to read a great Number of Books and Histories, written in ignorant and foolish Ages, and destitute of almost all other Characters that could be agreeable, but that single one of illustrating the Holy Scriptures ; since, I say, all this appears to me to be true, and that Sir *Isaac Newton* always speaks the real Sense of his own Mind ; I cannot but have the highest Honour and Veneration for this Book and its Author, how much soever I differ from him in particular Interpretations. And because I have my self formerly examined Sir *Isaac Newton's* Chronology ; Because I have my self long ago published my own Thoughts and Discoveries upon almost all the Subjects here treated of ; because the momentous *Truths* here laid down by so great a Man have a right to be supported and recommended ; and the Publick has a right to have his *Mistakes* noted and corrected ; I thought it incumbent on me particularly to consider this noble Work, with the several Expositions of Prophecies therein given, and assertions therein laid down ; to distinguish, so far as I am able, what is solid and well proved, from what seems to me, weak or conjectural, or even, not seldom, plainly erroneous ; and to endea-

endeavour, upon this uncommon Occasion, to improve and amend my own Notions, and farther to illustrate those sacred Writings that are now before us. In order to which Ends, I shall first begin with a few *General Reflections* on these *Observations*; and then shall proceed to the *Particular Application* of those *General Reflections* to the several Parts of this Work.

I. It appears to me, by all that I knew, or can learn by enquiry, or can gather from the Books themselves, that both the *Chronology*, and these *Observations upon Daniel and the Apocalypse* were first written by Sir *Isaac Newton* many Years ago; and when he was comparatively a young Man, or not more than 40, or at the utmost 50 Years of Age: As also that when he wrote the principal Parts over again, which he did very often, he never changed his original Plans, nor indeed ever made very great Alterations in them: But still endeavoured all along to corroborate and support them afterwards. So that Sir *Isaac Newton* made little Use of those Observations and Improvements of others which have been plentifully made since that Time; nor even of some earlier Writers; excepting Sir *John Marsham* in his *Chronology*; and *Sigonius* and Mr. *Mede* in these *Observations*. He seems to have digged long in the deepest Mines of Scripture and Antiquity for his precious Ore himself; and very rarely to have condescended to make use of the Thoughts or Discoveries of others on these Occasions.

II. Sir *Isaac Newton* almost always depends on the common *Masorete* Copy of the Old Testament, and on the commonly acknowledg'd Books of the New, and on them only; without any farther enquiry as to the *Samaritan Pentateuch*; as to the *Septuagint* Version; both which yet he here^a owns the Authority of; as to *Josephus's* Copy; as to

^a P. 3, 4, 12.

the Apostolical Constitutions ; as to *Clement's* Epistles, and the Shepherd of *Hermas* ; as to the larger Epistles of *Ignatius* ; as to the Recognitions of *Clement*, and other Apostolical Remains of the first Ages : As every one must take Notice quite through his *Chronology*, and quite through these *Observations*. Now since it has appear'd to me very plain, upon a through Examination, that the common *Masorete* Copy is the most imperfect of all our Copies of the Old Testament ; that very great Light is frequently to be had from the *Samaritan* and *Septuagint* ; and a great Deal more from *Josephus* ; as also that the Apostolical Constitutions, the Epistles of *Clement*, and the Shepherd of *Hermas* are evidently Writings of the first Century ; and the larger Epistles of *Ignatius*, with the Recognitions of *Clement*, were written early in the second : It must certainly be a very wrong Procedure to venture to determine about so many Points of *Chronology*, and Interpretations of *Scripture Prophecies*, without consulting those genuine Remains of *Jewish* and *Christian Antiquity* ; And so without that very great Assistance which may be derived from them. Which Assistance, I confess, I ever endeavour to have, before I make any such Determinations. This I take to be a principal Source of the Mistakes both in Sir *Isaac Newton's* *Chronology*, and in these his *Observations upon Daniel and the Apocalypse*.

III. However, where Sir *Isaac Newton* had large and numerous Books of known Authority to be his Guides, he has spared no Pains to discover the Truth of Facts by them. Thus he has thoroughly, and with great Sagacity^a traced the Affairs of the fourth Century, for the first Rise of Popery, even as far backward as the Days of *Athanasius* ; whose History and Conduct he perhaps better knew than did ever any other learned Man before him. He has, in

^a Chap. xiv.

the same Manner, and with the like Sagacity traced the Progress of Popery, and the gradual Rise and Increase of the Papal Power ^a through the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth Centuries. He has in the same Manner ^b traced the Histories of the Kings of *Egypt* and *Syria*, for the Explication of the XI Chapter of *Daniel*, with the Histories of the latter End of the fourth, and of the fifth Centuries ^c, for the Rise of the *Ten Kingdoms* in the *Roman Empire*. In these Cases, where a sufficient Number of proper Books lay before him, he wanted neither Diligence nor Sagacity in discovering the historical Facts he was desirous to know. I ascribe most of these Discoveries, tho' many of them were by no means new ones, to Sir *Isaac Newton* himself; because he seems generally, as I noted before, himself to have taken them out of the ancient Writers, from his own Observations, and frequently from them only. Nor ought any other learned Men, that will not take the like vast Pains in all these Originals, to despise the important Consequences of Sir *Isaac Newton's* Enquiries into these Matters; but to make the proper use of them, for the intire Discovery of what is real Anti-Christianism and Popery; and for the Rejection of the Reliques of it; which will hence appear to be still neither few nor inconsiderable; out of the Protestant Churches themselves.

IV. Where Sir *Isaac Newton* thought he wanted a sufficient Number of such authentick Records; as in very early Chronology, and in the Sense of several Prophecies ^d, with the Times of our Saviour's Birth, and Preaching, and Death ^e, and the Time of the Writing the ^fApocalypse, &c. he most unhappily despised the *Historical*, nay even most of the *Chronological* and *Astronomical* Characters which remained of those ancient Times; and ventured to furnish himself with new Materials from *his own Sa-*

^a Chap. viii.^b Chap. xii.^c Chap. v, vi.^d Chap. x.^e Chap. xi.^f Part II. Chap. i.

gacity; taking not a few Things for granted, as the Foundations of his Reasonings, which best suited his preconceived Opinions; tho' they were not supported, nay, tho' they were even contradicted by a great deal of real and positive Evidence. This way of *supposals* without, nay, against *positive Proofs*, runs through Sir *Isaac Newton's* whole *Chronology*; as I have at large shewed in my *Confutation* of it. And this is but too frequent in these his *Observations* on the Prophecies, as I shall shew presently; and this could not but betray him into many Mistakes in both these Treatises.

V. Sir *Isaac Newton's* Way of Writing, where he still speaks of his own bare *Conjectures* in the same Style, and apparently with the same positive Air of Assurance, as he does of his certain *Affertions*; (which Assurance yet he rarely used in private Conversation, about the same Subjects.) And the setting down no small Part of what he says, and can, throughly prove, without giving us even a Citation of the Proofs themselves, are both to be greatly taken Notice of: And all things built upon good Evidence are to be carefully distinguished from the Conjectures. The assisting the Reader in making which Distinction is one of the chief Designs of this Undertaking.

VI. Sir *Isaac Newton* seldom makes use of the great Authority of *Josephus*, the most learned Jew of the first Century; while he frequently allows the weak Authority, and ill-grounded Traditions of the *Talmud* in the fourth or fifth Centuries; and of even the still weaker Authority and more ill-grounded Traditions of the *Rabbins* afterwards; and this both in his Description of the *Jewish Temple*, inserted at the End of the V Chapter of his *Chronology*, and in these his *Observations on Daniel and the Apocalypse*. This is a Reflection very strange, but very true; and this could not but betray him into many uncertain, if not false Con-

clusions. However, from these six general Reflections, to be all along born in Mind and adapted to the several Chapters of this Book, I hope to afford some Light, at least to ordinary Readers ; and thereby to render their perusal of the Work it self, which in the main highly deserves it, of more Advantage to them.



REFLEXIONS

UPON

Sir ISAAC NEWTON'S OBSERVATIONS

Upon the

Prophecies of DANIEL.

CHAP. I.

Introduction ; *Concerning the Compilers
of the Books of the OLD TESTAMENT.*
p. I. — 15.

THIS Chapter I esteem in General to be written with great Honesty, Freedom, and Sagacity ; and, if no farther Light appeared as to the Compilers of the several Books of the Old Testament than what our *Masorete* Copy and the modern *Jews* afford us, which is all that Sir *Isaac Newton* seems to have had, it would deserve to be, for the main, admitted as true. For as to the present State of those Books, that they are by no means now in that exact Order, in that ge-
M m 2 nuine

nuine Perfection, and in that uncorrupt Condition wherein they were all at first written; I freely confess, and have fully proved in several of my Writings, especially in my *Essay towards restoring the true Text of the Old Testament*, and in the *second Dissertation* above; to which I refer the inquisitive Reader, who desires farther Satisfaction. In the mean Time, I am by no means satisfied with some of Sir Isaac Newton's Observations upon this Head. I do not at all suppose that the *Book or Codicil of the Law*^a to be read every seventh Year to the Jews at Jerusalem, and laid up ἐν τῷ ναῷ, in the Holy House it self, and there found upon the repairing of that House in the Days of Josiah, was the entire *Pentateuch*; as is here taken for granted; but only a small but most important Branch of it: the rest being laid up only ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, in the Courts of the Temple, as I have shewed already pag. 123. *suprà*. Nor do I believe the *Pentateuch* was ever properly lost, from the Days of Moses till this Day. Pious Jews, in their private Houses, could never all lose so great a Treasure; tho' the Discovery of what is now the most sacred Part of it, written most probably by Moses's own Hand, was an extraordinary Event, and occasioned an extraordinary Reformation in the Reign of Josiah. Nor do I suppose that all the Samaritans were taught by a single Priest, as Sir Isaac Newton^b, by following the *Masorete* Copy, 2 Kings xvii. 27, 28. affirms, but by several, as Josephus directly asserts; and as the *Masorete* and *Septuagint* Copies, when they here sometimes use the plural Number, do also imply. There might be indeed but one Priest to instruct those at Bethel; as both the *Masorete* and *Septuagint* assure us; yet might there be other Priests at the other principal Cities or Towns of Samaria notwithstanding. Nor indeed do I believe, with Sir Isaac Newton, the later Rabbins and the later

^a Sir Isaac Newton's Observations, p. 1, 2, 3.

^b p. 3.
Christians

Christians^a depending on these *Rabbins*, that the present *Chaldee* Character of the *Hebrew* Books of the Old Testament is earlier than the Days of *Barcho-cab*, in the second Century. Of which matter, see *Ess. on the O. T.* p. 149—164. That the Race of the *Kings of Edom* was over, and the *Dukes* had succeeded them in the Days of *Moses*, I have already shewed; as also that the Title of *King of Israel* was applied to others before *Saul*; and indeed that there was nothing in *Nehemiah's* or *Josephus's* Copy of the *Pentateuch* later than the Days of *Moses*, pag. 92—101. *suprà*. All the ancient Evidence is for *Moses*; and there is no Evidence for *Samuel*; whom the Lord *Barrington*^d would have to be the Compiler of part of the *Pentateuch*, and Sir *Isaac Newton*^e of the whole. So I still go by my Evidence, and believe that *Moses* and not *Samuel* compiled it: How imperfect soever our present Copies of it appear to be. And since the Objections made against this Assertion have been already either prevented or answered; and it has appeared, that the Clauses which have induced many of the Moderns to think otherwise are either mistaken, or are later than *Nehemiah*; and indeed that hardly any of them really belong to the *Pentateuch* it self, I take the ascribing it to *Samuel*, or to any other Author later than *Moses*, to stand upon a very weak Foundation. As for the Book of *Joshua*, I believe it was composed or revised by *Joshua* himself; excepting the usual Additions about his Death and Burial, which, of course, were to be added afterwards. The Book of *Judges*, and its Appendix *Ruth*^e, with that Part of the first Book of *Samuel* which relates to the Time before *Samuel's* Death, might well be compiled by *Samuel*; and this partly out of the publick Records written by the Order or under the Inspection of occasional

^a P. 4. P. 5.

^d Essay on Dispensations, p. 64--74.

^e Sir *Isaac Newton*, p. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

Prophets, or of the several Judges; and the rest from his own Knowledge. That the *Philistins* took out of the Ark the Book of the Law^a, and the Golden Pot of *Manna*, and *Aaron's Rod*; and yet left therein the two Tables of the Covenant; as is here said by Sir *Isaac Newton*, is to me a very strange Supposal. There appears both by ours and *Josephus's* Copies, *Ex. xl. 3.* *1 King. viii. 9.* *2 Chron. v. 10.* to have been *within* the Ark nothing but the two Tables of Stone originally. And it is clear by the whole History of the Ark, while it was in the Hands of the *Philistins*, *1 Sam. iv, v, vi, vii.* that they durst not be guilty of so great a Prophanation; nay, that had they attempted it they would have been stricken dead by the Hand of the God of *Israel*. As to the Historical Writings of Prophets, out of which the latter Part of the first Book of *Samuel*^b, the second Book; as also the Books of the *Kings* and *Chronicles* were afterward compiled, I do not much disagree from Sir *Isaac Newton's* Opinion. Only I think, that altho' our Books of *Chronicles* do really quote our Books of *Kings*; yet do not our Books of *Kings* quote our Books of *Chronicles*, as Sir *Isaac Newton* supposes; but those larger *Chronicles* rather, of which ours is but an Epitome: tho' I fully agree with him that the Book of *Chronicles of the Kings of Israel* cited in our Books of *Kings*, both the Original and the Epitome, are now lost^c. See *Ess. on the O. T. p. 77, 78.* What is so often said of *Ezra*^d, and his Writing the Books of the *Chronicles*, changing the Character of the sacred Books from the *Samaritan*, or genuine old *Hebrew*, to the *Chaldee*, collecting the sacred Books into one Body or Library, and correcting the Copies, by Sir *Isaac Newton*, Dr. *Prideaux*, and many others, seems to me only supported by the later *Talmudical* and *Rabbinical* Writers; and contrary to the much

^a P. 7.^b P. 8, 9, 10.^c P. 11.^d P. 9, 10, 11. *Prid. Connect. ad. an. 446.*

earlier and better Authority of the second Book of *Maccabees*, which ascribes nothing to *Ezra*; but expressly ascribes the Collection of the sacred *Hebrew* Books to *Nebemiah*, 2 *Macc.* ii. 13. as Sir *Isaac Newton* also rightly observes in this Place. Nor is there any real Evidence that *Ezra* did any thing more than write the first Book of our Apocryphal *Esdra*s, whose original *Hebrew* has been long lost; our present *Hebrew Ezra* being only an Epitome of that Book; and not appearing in the World before the second or perhaps the fourth Century; all which I have proved elsewhere, *Ess. on the O. T.* p. 50—55. Nor could *Ezra* [or *Nebemiah*] write the second Book of *Chronicles*, as it now stands; because it is there said *Chap.* v. 9. that the *Ark*, or its *Staves*, were in the Oracle, or most Holy Place of the Temple, *unto this Day*: Which was true till the *Babylonish* Captivity, but not after it, in the Days of *Ezra* and *Nebemiah*. Tho' I allow so far of Sir *Isaac Newton's* Observation to be true, that not only the *two last Verses*, but the *two last Chapters* of that second Book of *Chronicles* belonged originally, not to those *Chronicles*, but to the genuine *Ezra* or *Esdra*s; as the Beginning of that Book rightly places them. As to the Prophecies of *Isaiab*, of *Jeremiab*, of *Ezekiel*, of *Daniel*, and of the xii Minor Prophets^b; to be sure none could write them, but themselves; or *Amanuenses* like *Baruch*, from their own Mouths. Nor do I suppose that any one but *Daniel* wrote the former six Chapters of that Book; which, for the main, are Historical Chapters; as well as he certainly wrote the 6 Prophetical Chapters that follow them. The Words, that *Daniel continued till the first Year of King Cyrus*, *Chap.* i. 21; and that *this Daniel prospered in the Reign of Darius, and in the Reign of Cyrus the Persian*, vi. 28. which Sir *Isaac Newton* esteems Marks of another Author, if they prove so much, ' might,

^b P. 10.

as he justly observes, be added by the Collector ' of the Papers : ' Whom he takes to be *Ezra*, and I believe to be *Nehemiab*. Nor can I agree with him and others, that any one but *David* wrote the Book or Books of *Psalms*. The most ancient Citations ascribe them all to him, as I have elsewhere noted and proved, *Ess. on the O. T.* p. 174, 175. If in our present Collection there be now inserted one Psalm of *Moses*, xc, and two so late as the *Babylonish* Captivity, lxxiv and cxxxvii, of none of which am I yet fully satisfied, these three Insertions ought not to oblige us, without any sufficient Evidence, to ascribe other Psalms to other Authors than to *David* himself. Why Sir *Isaac Newton*^a supposes that *Judas Maccabeus* added Part of the Prophecies of *Isaiab*, or some other Prophet, to the End of the Prophecies of *Zechariab* ; while that latter Part of our *Zechariab* is ever and only cited as belonging to *Jeremiab*, till the very Days of *Barbocab*, in the second Century, I cannot possibly understand, See *Ess. on the O. T.* p. 93, 94, 95. What Sir *Isaac Newton*^b here says, that the *Jews*, since the Destruction of the Temple by *Titus*, dropped the ancients various Lections, and intruded marginal Notes and other Corruptions into the Text, is too sadly true. Only I can by no means agree with him, when he farther asserts, that we have no other Assistance but the *Septuagint* Version to discover the ancient various Lections by : Since, upon an intire Comparison of the Historical Books, not only with that Version, but with the *Hebrew*, the *Samaritan*, and *Josephus's* Copies, I have discovered many more, and several more important various Lections, and genuine Texts omitted, by their means, than by the means of the *Septuagint* Version it self. That the *Jews* did not of Old read the former Prophets, or the Historical Books of the Old Testament ; and the Ha-

^a P. II.^b P. II, 12.

giographa, or the Books of *Job*, *Psalms*, *Proverbs*, and *Ecclesiastes*, as well as the *Law* or *Pentateuch* in their Synagogues; or that Christ, by laying the Stress of his Religion on *the Law and the Prophets*, designed to exclude any of the sacred Books of the *Jews*; or that the *Hagiographa* included those former *Prophets*, as the *Jews* call the Historical Books, I know no Evidence in the World, but the direct contrary. See *Constitut.* V. 20. Such Assertions ought to have been thoroughly proved, as well as readily supposed, before our Assent is required to them. Nor is there, I believe, any more Foundation for what is farther asserted here, that *Ezra* did therefore read only the *Book of the Law* to the People on the seventh Month, or Feast of Tabernacles, because the Writings of the *Prophets* were not then collected. Nor are there, by my Observation, fewer, but more numerous Disorders and Dislocations in the *Prophets*, than in the *Hagiographa* themselves: which is contrary to Sir *Isaac Newton's* Observation. See *Authent. Records*, p. 751—794. However I cannot leave this first Chapter, without going backwards, and remarking into what a great Mistake Sir *Isaac Newton* is led, even in his second Page^b, by following his darling *Masorete* Copy, and his neglect of consulting the *Septuagint* and *Josephus*. He quotes this *Masorete* Text out of 2 *Chron.* xv. 3, 5, 6. with the Omission of v. 4. which even in his own Copy contradicts his Notion of the other. For he affirms, that the Monarchy of *Egypt* under *Shishak* brought the *Jews* or two Tribes, into great Troubles, for about 20 Years; and that they were then, in the Words of *Azariab* the Son of *Oded*, the Prophet, *Without the true God, and without a teaching Priest, and without Law; and that in those Times there was no Peace to him that went out, nor to him that came in; and great Vexation was upon all the Inhabitants of*

the Countries; and Nation was destroyed of Nation, and City of City: For God did vex them with all Adversity. What he has omitted runs thus, in the same *Masorete* Copy: *Now for a long Season, Israel had been without the true God, &c. But when in their Trouble they did turn unto the Lord God of Israel, and sought him, he was found of them.* And all this without any Pretence of Truth or Authority, unless it be strained to refer to the Times of the Judges; I mean as to the two Tribes, to which they are peculiarly applied by Sir *Isaac Newton*. Now 'tis evident, that in all Copies it is *Israel*, and not *Judab* which is here spoken of: And both *Josephus* in the whole, and the *Septuagint* in part rightly make it a *Prediction* of what Miseries were *hereafter* to come on the xii Tribes, when in their idolatrous State; in which the x Tribes already were; that they should for many Days or a long Time be under the Curse of God, both in their spiritual and temporal Affairs; that yet, when they should turn to the Lord God of *Israel*, and seek him, he would be found of them; and all still by way of *Prediction* as to the intire xii Tribes, and *Caution* as to the ii Tribes; and all in such a manner as exactly came to pass accordingly in the following Ages. This is an Example of the Imperfection of the *Masorete*, and of the Preference of the *Septuagint's* and *Josephus's* Copies, that ought never to be forgotten.

But as to the two last Pages of Sir *Isaac Newton's* first Chapter ^b, which are of the greatest Importance to the Christian Church of any in his whole Book, I not only highly approve of them, but admire and reverence him for them; and earnestly recommend the Consideration of them to the whole Christian World; especially of that Branch of them which affirms, that "The giving Ear to the Prophets

^b P. 13, 14, 15.

“ is a fundamental Character of the true Church :
 “ ——— That the Authority of Emperours, Kings,
 “ and Princes is Human : The Authority of
 “ Councils, Synods, Bishops and Presbyters is
 “ Human : The Authority of the Prophets is Di-
 “ vine, and comprehends the Sum of Religion ;
 “ reckoning *Moses* and the Apostles among the
 “ Prophets. And, *If an Angel from Heaven preach*
 “ *any other Gospel than what they have delivered,*
 “ *let him be accursed.* Their Writings contain the
 “ Covenant between God and his People ; with
 “ Instructions for keeping this Covenant ; instances
 “ of God’s Judgments upon them that break it ;
 “ and Predictions of Things to come : While
 “ the People of God keep the Covenant, they
 “ continue to be his People : When they break it,
 “ they cease to be his People or Church, and be-
 “ come the *Synagogue of Satan ; who say they are*
 “ *Jews, and are not.* And no Power on Earth
 “ is authoriz’d to alter this Covenant”. So far
 Sir *Isaac Newton*. I only add the usual solemn
 Words of our Saviour, *He that hath Ears to hear,*
let him hear.

C H A P. II.

Of the Prophetick Language. p. 16.—23.

THIS particular and minute Enumeration of the Interpretations of Prophetick Symbols and Language by Sr. I. N. if it could be as readily *proved*, as it is here distinctly *set down*, would be truly inestimable; and the Prophecies would be easily decyphered, and put into common Language. However, there is no doubt but a great Part of it is very natural, and very true: And we hereby learn the particular Sense in which our great Author takes them upon all Occasions. But still, some of these Explications, I think, can hardly be maintain'd: As when Sr. I. N. affirms^a, that *Burning any Thing with Fire*, is put for the *consuming any Thing by War*: A *Conflagration of the Earth*, or *turning a Countrey into a Lake of Fire*, for the *Consumption of a Kingdom by War*: The being *in a Furnace [of Fire,]* for their being *in Slavery under another Nation*: The *ascending up of the Smoke of any burning Thing for ever and ever*, for the *Continuation of a conquered People under the Misery of perpetual Subjection and Slavery*.——*Dens and Rocks of Mountains*, for the *Temples of Cities*^b: The *biding of Men in those Dens and Rocks*, for the *shutting up of Idols in their Temples*^c: The *Image of a Beast*, for a *Council of a Kingdom*^d: The *Dragon*, for the *Heathen Religion*: Which Dragon yet is distinctly explain'd, to be the grand Supporter of that and all false Religion, not that false Religion it self; ^e *that old Serpent, the Devil and Satan, who decei-*

^a P. 18.^b P. 19.^c P. 22.^d P. 280.^e P. 280.

with the whole World, — and is the Accuser of the Brethren: As Sir I. N. here expressly takes notice. In most of the rest of these Explications of Prophetick Symbols and Language, Interpreters are pretty well agreed; but in these, I believe, they never have agreed nor ever will agree: At least not till some good *Proofs* be given for them: Which yet I take to be impossible.

C H A P. III.

Of the Vision of the Image composed of four Metals. p. 24.—27.

THE main Part of this short Chapter I take to be certain, and of the greatest Consequence to the understanding of the Scripture Prophecies in general, and particularly of those in the rest of *Daniel* and the *Apocalypse*; and has been all along agreed to by the *Jews* and *Christians* from the Days of *Daniel* to the last Century; when one or two great Men, upon some weak Prejudices of their own, would rather have the *Seleucidae* and *Lagidae* to be the fourth Monarchy, than the Empire of the *Romans*. Mr. Mede justly calls the Vision of the Image of four Metals, and that Parallel one of the four Beasts, as understood of the *Babylonian*, *Medo-Persian*, *Grecian* and *Roman* Monarchies to be the A. B. C. of Scripture Prophecies, or the plainest Thing in the World. And I cannot but fully agree with him therein. See Essay on the Rev. p. 18.—27. Only I cannot but lament the strange Mixture there is here in our Great Author, of one most uncertain, or rather plainly false Notion, with the rest, which are so certain; I mean when he says that

that “ *Cyrus*,^a within a few Months of the Conquest of *Babylon*, revolted to the *Persians*, and set them up above the *Medes*:” A Thing in its own nature unaccountable, that *Cyrus*, who had already been the General of the *Persians*, his own Countrymen for 21 Years, should revolt to the *Persians*; and a Thing, I believe, utterly unknown to all the Writers of Antiquity also. I almost imagine that this is a Mistake in transcribing, and that Sir *I. N.* means that *Cyrus* revolted from the *Medes*, and set up the *Persians* above them: As his Notion is elsewhere; altho’ I cannot agree to the Truth of it in that Acceptation neither at this time, as utterly unsupported by the History of *Cyrus*. See more presently.

C H A P. IV.

Of the Vision of the four Beasts.

p. 28.—32.

THE main Part of this short Chapter is very much of the same Nature, and the Interpretations therein contained of the same Certainty and Importance with those in the former Chapter. Only I cannot but Query, whether the two Wings^b of the Lyon denote two Kingdoms? And not rather the Swiftnes of the Lyon’s Motion; as seems to have been the Case of the Bull with two Horns, and the Wings of an Eagle on his Back, in the Testament of *Nephtbalim* § 5. Or if they do denote two Kingdoms, whether those Kingdoms were *Babylonia* and *Media*; which tho’ they once joined against *Ni-*

^a P. 26.

^b P. 28.

neweb, yet never were, I think, united at any other Time. My Reason is, that the *Babylonian* Monarchy, here said to join against the *Assyrian*, is still supposed both in the Scripture, in *Ptolemy's Canon*, and in *Xenophon* to be a Continuation of the *Assyrian*, with only the Difference of their Capitals. The oldest *Assyrian* Empire having had *Babylon* for its Capital; the later *Assyrian* Empire having had *Niniveb*; and the latest having again had *Babylon* for that Capital. See *Marsh. Chron.* p. 579. I also Query, Whether *Porphyrius's* Enumeration of the four Branches of the *Grecian* Monarchy, wherein *Antigonus*, the King of the greater Kingdom is taken in; and *Lyfimachus*, the King of the lesser Kingdom is left out (See *Lit. Accompl. of Proph.* p. 28, 29) be not preferable to that of Sir *Isaac Newton's* which takes in *Lyfimachus*, and leaves out *Antigonus*? I farther Query, Whether the Words of *Daniel*, that the three former Beasts had their Dominion taken away by the fourth Beast^a; while yet their Lives were preserved not for, but until a Season and a Time; or, as it is in *Theodotion's* Version, until a Season, and a Season, but as we elsewhere render that Hebrew Word, which he renders Season, until a Time, and a Time, or two Times, i.e. two prophetick Years, equal to 720 historical Years; it being about that Interval from the *Romans* Conquest of the *Grecian* Empire, till the first Rise of the *Saracens* and *Turks* in that and the former Empires: I say, I Query, Whether the Prophecy will support Sir *Isaac Newton's* Inferences here? that “ Therefore all the four Beasts are still alive, tho’ the Dominion of the three first be taken away; and that therefore ——— we are to look for all the Body of the third Beast among the Nations on this side of the River *Euphrates*; and for all

^a P. 31.

“ the eleven Horns of the fourth Beast among the
 “ Nations on this side of *Greece*, and therefore^b
 “ at the breaking of the *Greek* Empire into four
 “ Kingdoms of the *Greeks*, he includes no part of
 “ the *Chaldeans*, *Medes*, and *Persians*, in those King-
 “ doms; because they belonged to the Bodies of
 “ the two first Beasts: Nor does he reckon the
 “ *Greek* Empire seated at *Constantinople* among the
 “ Horns of the fourth Beast, because it belonged
 “ to the Body of the third”. I offer these
 Things by Way of Query, because I am not sa-
 tisfied enough to affirm, that these *Corollaries* are
 any of them intirely false; yet do they seem to
 me to be carried farther, much farther than the
 Prophet's Words will bear; and that the Founda-
 tions of the whole may deserve to be farther en-
 quired into. This I am pretty sure of, that when
 I first received this curious Notion from Sir *Isaac*
Newton of the *Geographical*, as well as *Chronological*
 Distinction of the four Monarchies, and by his Per-
 mission preserv'd it in my own *Essay on the Reve-*
lations, written 27 Years ago, p. 258, 259, I did
 not think of its Extension so far; nor that all
 the *Corollaries* from it in Sir *Isaac Newton's* present
 Work would follow from it. And since, tho' the
Lives of the three former Beasts were preserv'd, yet
 their *Dominion* was still taken away by the fourth
 Monarchy, the *Corollaries* relating to any Conti-
 nuance of their *Empire* or *Dominion* must be inde-
 fensible. I always allowed *Seleucus*, even while his
 Dominion was beyond *Euphrates*, to be one of
 the four Horns of the third or *Grecian* Empire;
 and the Empire of *Constantinople* to be one of the
 ten Horns of the fourth or *Roman* Empire; not-
 withstanding my Admission all the while of Sir
Isaac Newton's Distinction here refer'd to.

^b P. 32.

CHAP. V.

Of the Kingdoms represented by the Feet of the Image composed of Iron and Clay. p. 33---46.

THIS Chapter being wholly Historical, and taken from the best and most esteemed Historians of the fourth, fifth, and sixth Centuries, is, I suppose, a faithful Account of the gradual Breaches made in the intire *Roman Empire*, and of the gradual Rise and Acts of the several Kingdoms into which it was parted in the fourth and fifth Centuries; and requires no particular Reflexions.

CHAP. VI.

Of the ten Kingdoms, represented by the ten Horns of the fourth Beast, p. 47---73.

THE Origin of these ten Kingdoms being of very great Consequence to the right Understanding of *Daniel* and the *Apocalypse*, and to the Determination of the Conclusion of the present Antichristian State of Christendom, I shall treat of this Subject in a more distinct Manner, than I do of the rest; and that, by first producing Sir *Isaac Newton's* and then my own Catalogue of those ten Kingdoms; and at what time they every one of

O o

them

them arose in the *Roman Empire*; with the Reasons I go upon when I differ from Sir *Isaac Newton's* Determinations.

Sir Isaac Newton's ten Kingdoms within the Limits of the Old Roman Empire are these; but digested into the Order of their Rise.

	A.D.
(1) <i>Lombards in Pannonia, under King Agilmund, &c.</i>	389
(2) <i>Visigoths in Gaul and Spain, under King Alaric, &c.</i>	400
(3) <i>Huns in Pannonia, under Oſar and Rugila, &c.</i>	406
(4) <i>Vandals and Alans in Spain and Africa, under Godeſilus, &c.</i>	407
(5) <i>Suevians in Luſitania, under Ermeric, &c.</i>	407
(6) <i>Alans in Gaul, about Orleans under Goar, &c.</i>	407
(7) <i>Burgundians in Gaul, under Gundicar, &c.</i>	407
(8) <i>Franks in Gaul, under Theudomir, &c.</i>	407
(9) <i>Britains in Britain, under Marcus, &c.</i>	407
(10) <i>Western Empire at Ravenna, under Honorius, &c.</i>	408

So

So that Sir *Isaac Newton's* Opinion is clear, as he directly assures us also, p. 47, and 73. that *these* are the *ten Kingdoms* foretold in *Daniel* and the *Apocalypse*; and that they were real Kingdoms, actually settled within the Bounds of the *Roman Empire*, about two Years before *Rome* was first sack'd by the *Goths*, which was *A.D.* 410. But let us now particularly examine, how far History will agree to these Kingdoms, and to their Rise so early; and let us consider whether several of them are not here numbred, or these early Dates here given them, without sufficient Foundation in the original Historians.

(1) As for the *Lombards*, *Paulus Diaconus* indeed says^b, that they, with many other *Gothick Nations*, came into the Empire, from beyond the *Danube*, in the Reign of *Arcadius* and *Honorius*; that is, between the Years 395 and 408, nor is it impossible that they might come in a little earlier, and beat the *Vandals* there, as early as 375, so Sir *Isaac Newton* says, p. 70. Altho' *Jerom*, who then lived and wrote, in his particular Enumeration of the barbarous Nations that brake into the Empire about this Time, does not mention these *Lombards*. See *Essay on the Revelation*, p. 160. But that these *Lombards* stayed then in *Pannonia*, and then settled a Kingdom there, Sir *Isaac Newton* does not pretend to prove. The *Lombards* might also be strong enough, out of the Bounds of the Empire, to fight the *Bulgarians*, a *Scythian Nation*, near the *Volga* and remote from the Empire, in *A.D.* 423. They might also, many of them, come from *Pannonia* into *Rugia* with *Odoacer* and his *Heruli*, *A.D.* 476, both which you have in Sir *Isaac Newton*: but all this without their having then a Kingdom, settled within the Bounds of the Empire. However, Sir *Isaac*

^b P. 69, 70, 71.

Newton and all agree that *A. D. 526*, these *Lombards* set up a Kingdom in *Pannonia*; and that *A. D. 568*, they came out of *Pannonia* into *Italy*, and there conquered the *Ostrogoths*, and there settled a known Kingdom in that part of the Country, which has ever since born their Name, and is still called *Lombardy*. So that upon the whole, as it seems to me, this Kingdom of the *Lombards* may best be dated from the Origin of their known Kingdom in *Pannonia*, *A. D. 526*. they having then, and most probably not till then, any remarkable separate Dominion or Kingdom within the *Roman Empire*.

(2) As to the *Visigoths*^b, since they were not received into the *Roman Empire*, I mean into *Aquitain*, as *Sir Isaac Newton* confesses, till *Vallia* their third King, had merited such a Reception, by assisting *Honorius's* General *Constantius* against the *Vandals* and other Barbarians, *A. D. 418*, or *419*, That seems to me to be the most proper Date of this Kingdom.

(3) The *Huns*^c might have a settlement, and even a Kingdom in *Pannonia*, *A. D. 408*, under *Ostar* and *Rugila*; and in *A. D. 433*, under *Bleda* and *Attila*, till the Death of *Attila*, *A. D. 454*, or *455*, as *Sir Isaac Newton* affirms. However, since he grants and observes, that just after *Attila's* Death, the *Ostrogoths* had Seats granted them in *Pannonia*, and together with the *Romans* ejected the *Huns* out of that Countrey, I cannot find any Kingdom of the *Huns*, or any considerable Dominion to them belonging within the Empire for more than a Century afterwards. Then indeed it is allowed by all, that these *Huns* settled themselves in *Pannonia*, *A. D. 567*, and from their own Name,

^b P. 49, 50.

^c P. 62—69.

and the Name of their Partners the *Avars*, gave it the Name of *Hung-Avars* or *Hungary*, which it retains at this Day. But this Time is quite too late for the Origin of any Kingdom which should be reckoned among the *first Ten*, into which the *Roman Empire* was divided in the fifth Century.

(4) The *Vandals* and *Alans* [and *Suevians*] might set up certain Kingdoms in *Gaul* and *Spain*, about *A.D.* 407. according to Sir *Isaac Newton*; altho' it be certain that the most famous and lasting Kingdom of the *Vandals* was not there, but in *Africa*, and was not granted them by the *Romans* till *A.D.* 435. Which I therefore think the proper Date of their Kingdom. It is indeed true, that the three before mentioned Nations, did at first make *three* distinct Kingdoms, (1) That of the *Vandals* or *Silingi*. (2) That of the *Alans*. (3) That of the *Suevians*. Yet is it also true, that long before the other nine Kingdoms were compleated, the *Alans* had conquered the *Vandals* and *Silingi*, and the *Goths* had also conquered that of the *Alans*; and so there remained but one Kingdom out of all these *three*; that of the *Suevians*, and afterwards of the *Vandals*, not in *Gaul* or *Spain*, but in *Africa*; as has been already determined, *A.D.* 435. See *Essay on the Revel.* p. 224.

(5) That remaining Kingdom of the *Suevians*,^b as once a Branch of the foregoing Kingdom of the *Vandals*, &c. must indeed be dated at or soon after *A.D.* 407, as Sir *Isaac Newton* reckons. And since it continued a separate Kingdom at the Time the *Vandals* went into *Africa*, and continued a Kingdom in *Lusitania*, for about 174 Years, there need be no Dispute about the Reality or the Date of this, as of one of the *ten Kingdoms* then arisen, in the fifth Century, within the *Roman Empire*. See *Ess. on the Rev.* p. 224, 228, 230.

^a P. 48—49.

^b P. 49.

(6) The

(6) The Kingdom of ^athe *Alans* in *Gaul*, whose Royal Seat was at *Orleance*, seems here also rightly stated by Sir *Isaac Newton* at or soon after *A. D.* 407, at least its Date cannot by his Accounts, be later than *A. D.* 412. But then, it ought to be confest that these *Alans* were so thoroughly beaten upon their Invasion of *Italy*, in 464, by *Ricimer* the Emperor's General; and again about 480, and again about 511 by others, as Sir *Isaac Newton* grants, that they make too poor a Figure ever afterwards to be esteemed one of the considerable Kingdoms still continuing in the *Roman Empire*. Nay, Mr. *Mede*, questions whether there were any proper Kingdom of the *Alans* subsisting at all in the Empire after their first Defeat, by *Gilimer*, *A. D.* 464. See *Essay on the Rev.* p. 233. So I do not allow this small and vanishing Kingdom any Place among those ten Kingdoms, *A. D.* 476, tho' Sir *Isaac Newton* might justly reckon it one of them, at *A. D.* 407, or 408.

(7) The *Burgundians*^b, tho' they invaded *Gaul* in 407, as Sir *Isaac Newton* truly affirms, yet were not they admitted there-into by the Emperor, as Sir *Isaac Newton* confesses, till the Year 412, or 413. Whence I reckon their Kingdom to take its Date from one of those Years, and not sooner.

(8) Whether *Theudomir*, about the Year 407. as Sir *Isaac Newton* would have it; or *Pbaramond* his Son, about 419, is to be esteemed the first King^c of the *Franks* in *Gaul*, I shall not eagerly contend; the Difference of the Dates is but 12 Years. Sir *Isaac Newton* confesses, that *Labbe's MS. Bibliotheca*, and the *Roman Writers*, esteem *Pbaramond* the first King; as for certain do the generality of

^a P. 50, 51, 52.

^b P. 52, 53.

^c P. 53—58.

the *French* Historians themselves also. Which Date I therefore prefer to the other.

(9) Sir *Isaac Newton* reckons *Marcus, Gratian,* and *Constantine*, three *Roman Tyrants*, as he calls them; (all of them together not reigning so long as one Year distinctly in *Britain*, and hardly four Years any where else:) as the three first *Kings* * of the *Britains*; and admits an Interregnum of 14 (it should be of 36 Years) before *Vortigern*; whom all Historians esteem their first King; and most of them agree was not chosen till *A.D.* 447. It is true, that the *Romans* Affairs were reduced so low for several Years under *Honorius*, in the former half of the fifth Century, that they were generally forced to leave *Britain* almost unguarded. Yet is it withal true, that the *Britains* had not all that Time cast off the *Roman* Government; but esteemed the *Romans* still as their Patrons; and that the *Romans* more than once sent them Legions to support them all that while; till the third Consulship of *Ætius*, or *A. D.* 446, when they let them know they could support them no longer. Whereupon they, the very next Year, set up *Vortigern* for their King. So that by far the best Evidence of History the Kingdom of the *Britains* takes its Date *A. D.* 447, and not sooner.

(10) As to the Remains of the *Western* ^b *Empire* from the Time that *Honorius* left *Rome* and lived at *Ravenna*, about *A. D.* 402, or 408, which I did formerly, and Sir *Isaac Newton* still does reckon one of these *ten Kingdoms*; I cannot now esteem it under that Character; for besides that the City and Territory of *Rome* was to belong to the *xith* or *little Horn*, rather than to the *x* Horns; and that the *x* Horns are all at length to hate the *Whore* or

the City of Rome, and to make her desolate, and burn her with Fire, Apoc. xvii. 16. as if this City and the adjoining Territory were somewhat distinct from these x Kingdoms, we are expressly assured, that those ten Kings had not received their Kingdom in the Days of St. John v. 12. which cannot be said of these remains of the Roman or Western Empire, but only of the New Kingdoms to arise therein afterward.

As for the Eastern Empire, which I still admit among the ten Latin Kingdoms, on Account of those Parts of it which were never under the Monarchy of the Old Greeks; and especially on Account of the Exarchate of Ravenna thereto certainly belonging in Italy it self, for about 186 Years, from the Year 567 till 753, but which Sir Isaac Newton wholly excludes, I must say, that in excluding this Kingdom, he seems to me to contradict his own Hypothesis. He fully allows, with me, that this Exarchate of Ravenna was one of the three Kingdoms which the little Horn or papal Power subdued but of the Ten.^a And since it was certainly a Branch of the Greek or Constantinopolitan Empire, and governed by that Empire's Exarch or Deputy when it was subdued A.D. 753, I think it cannot be denied, that this Greek Empire ought to be reckoned for one of the ten Horns or ten Kingdoms into which the Roman Empire was parted in the fourth or fifth Centuries, even upon the Principles of Sir Isaac Newton himself.

As for the Alemanni in Rætia, set down in Mr. Mede's Catalogue of these Kingdoms, Op. pag. 577, and 815, Sir Isaac Newton's Observations^b agree with mine, *Ess. on the Rev.* p. 233, that it was no settled Kingdom in Rætia, but mainly seated in Germany, out of the Bounds of the Roman Empire, and so was none of these x Kingdoms.

^a P 74. &c.

^b P. 72.

But if any one should enquire, Why Sir *Isaac Newton* has intirely omitted the *three Kingdoms*, of the *Ostrogoths* in *Pannonia*; of the *Saxons* in *Britain*; and of the *Heruli* in *Italy*: all which undeniably arose in the same Century, within the same *Roman Empire*, and upon its Dissolution; and were new Kingdoms also within its Limits; the Answer is easy, that they arose too late for Sir *Isaac Newton's Hypothesis*; and did not begin till near half a Century after the first in his Catalogue. Otherwise they had very probably been esteemed by him as three of those ten Kingdoms; as I clearly take them to be.

I therefore, laying aside all such Hypotheses, and Prejudices, am obliged, by the Force of the ancient Testimonies, thus to determine the Rise of the *ten* several Kingdoms into which the *Roman* or *Latin Empire* was parted, before or in the fifth Century. See *Eff. on the Rev.* p. 216——235.

	<i>A.D.</i>
(1) <i>Suevians</i> , &c. in <i>Lusitania</i> , about	407
(2) Either the <i>Greek Empire</i> , <i>A.D.</i> 337, at <i>Constantinople</i> , or the <i>Roman</i> at <i>Ravenna</i> , about	408
(3) <i>Burgundians</i> in <i>Gaul</i> , about	413
(4) <i>Visigoths</i> in <i>Gaul</i> and <i>Spain</i> , about	418
(5) <i>Franks</i> in <i>Gaul</i> , about	419
(6) <i>Vandals</i> in <i>Africa</i> , about	435
(7) <i>Britains</i> in <i>Britain</i> , about	447
(8) <i>Ostrogoths</i> in <i>Pannonia</i> , about	454
(9) <i>Saxons</i> in <i>Britain</i> , about	455
(10) <i>Heruli</i> , &c. in <i>Italy</i> ,	476

N. B. It is here to be carefully observed, that altho' this Catalogue of mine differ in no fewer than *four* Kingdoms, out of *ten* from Sir *Isaac Newton's*, yet do we not really differ near so much in the History. When Sir *Isaac Newton* enumerates these Kingdoms about *A. D.* 400, 406, 407, and 408, he allows the *Lombards* to be settled so early in *Pannonia*, which I cannot find to have been there settled till *A. D.* 526. He truly reckons the *Huns* as then settled in *Pannonia*, and the *Alans* in *Gaul*: which yet were, the former expell'd, and the latter conquered several Years before *A. D.* 476, which is the Year of my Enumeration, the Kingdoms not till then amounting to the Number of *ten*; whence these could not be in my Catalogue, tho' they ought to be in *his*.

He also omits the *Eastern Empire*, which I admit; and admits the Remains of the *Western Empire* which I exclude. Nor could his Catalogue include either the *Ostrogoths*, the *Saxons*, or the *Heruli*, as mine does; because they were none of them arisen in the Empire till many Years after *A. D.* 408, but were without Dispute arisen and settled therein by *A. D.* 476.

N. B. It must also be here carefully observed, that the *tenth* or last Kingdom is now in my Catalogue, the *Heruli*, and those other *Goths* and *Barbarians* that were joined with them, *A. D.* 476, and succeeded them *A. D.* 492, and were afterwards conquered and succeeded by the *Lombards*, *A. D.* 526, or the same that long afterwards *A. D.* 774, conquered the *Lombards*, and set up their Kingdom of the *Franks*, *Italians* and *Germans* successively in *Italy*; whose Succession and History you have in *Sigonius*; as continuing from *A. D.* 774, till *A. D.* 1286, for 512 Years. See *Eff.*

on the Rev. p. 250. So that if the τὸ δέκαλον τῆς πόλεως ἔπεσε, *The tenth Part of the City fell*, Apoc. xi. 13. refer to the *tenth* and last of these Kingdoms, as I formerly supposed, See *Ess. on the Rev.* p. 227. it must belong to the Successors of this *Italian Kingdom*, and to their fall at the Conclusion of the 1260 Days or Years of the two Witnesses, about or soon after A. D. 1736. Had the Words of St. John been, τὸ δέκαλον τῶν κεράτων, *the tenth of the Horns*; or, ἡ δεκάτη τῶν βασιλειῶν, *the tenth of the Kingdoms*; this Interpretation would have been much surer. However, I leave it still with the Reader, for his farther Consideration, or for the Determination by the Event; as not being my self sufficiently satisfied to make any positive Determination about it.

N. B. 'Tis well worth observing, how near *Macchiavel* himself, in his *History of Florence*, tho', as Bishop *Chandler* takes Notice, little thinking what he was doing, comes to this Catalogue, both as to the exact Number of ten Kingdoms, and as to the Kingdoms themselves that made up the ten; which the Bishop sets particularly down from that History, *Vindicat. of the Defence of Christianity*, Vol. I. pag. 253, 254. Nor are the Words of *Grotius* in his *Gothick History* produced by the Bishop to the like purpose, pag. 257, 258, less remarkable; to which I refer the inquisitive Reader.

CHAP. VII.

Of the eleventh Horn of Daniel's fourth Beast, p. 74—89.

THE principal Point with which Sir *Isaac Newton* is here concern'd is, to state the *three Horns* or *Kingdoms* out of the *ten* which the little Horn or papal Power was to *displant*, to *cast down*, and to *subdue*. Sir *Isaac Newton* reckons them to be (1.) the *Exarchate*^b of *Ravenna*, belonging then to the *Grecian Empire*; (2.) the Kingdom of the *Lombards*; and (3.) the City of *Rome*, with its Duchy. I fully agree to the two former, and do very little disagree to the last: I mean that instead of the smaller Part, or *Rome* with its Duchy, I take in the whole Kingdom of *Italy* of which *Rome* was the Capital; as being more considerable, more properly by Succession one of the ten Kingdoms, and evidently *displanted*, *cast down*, and *subdued* in a long Period of Time by the Pope, at the Head of his *Guelfs*; in opposition to the Emperor, at the Head of his *Gibellins*. Of all which see *Eff. on the Rev.* p. 249—252.

^b P. 75, &c.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Power of the eleventh Horn of Daniel's fourth Beast to change Times and Laws, p. 90---114.

THIS Chapter is almost wholly Historical, and taken from undoubted Records, like Chap. v. and is, I doubt not, generally speaking, a faithful Account of the gradual Rise and Establishment of the papal ecclesiastical Tyranny, in the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth Centuries. The only thing I here differ from Sir *Isaac Newton* in, is this: That he delays to reckon the Time of this Horn or the Date of its *Time Times and a Part*, or *Time Times and a Half*, till the latter End of the viiith Century, about *A. D.* 794, when he ^b supposes his *temporal Dominion* began. Had this little Horn indeed been one of the *ten secular Horns or Kingdoms*, this might have deserved Consideration: But since this Horn was not to be one of the *ten*, but was to be *another* or *eleventh* Horn, and to be *diverse* from the *ten*, *Dan.* vii. 24. And since all the Pope's temporal Power, excepting his own small Dominions in *Italy*, was ever and only such *per accidens*, and *in ordine ad spiritualia*; since the Description of this little Horn, this *Man of Sin*, this *second Beast* in *Daniel*, *Paul*, and *John*, rather suits to that *spiritual Tyranny* the Pope exercised over Christians, than to any *temporal Dominion*, see *Ess* on the *Rev.* p. 242---246; since this Date in Sir *Isaac Newton* puts the End of the papal Dominion so many Centuries la-

^b P. 113, 114.

ter than the End of its Supporters the ten Kings, and than all the collateral Prophecies will admit; and since *A. D.* 606, is a Date so much more celebrated and remarkable; I still greatly prefer it before this new, and hitherto unsuspected Date of that Tyranny. See *Eff. on the Rev.* p. 244—248.

CHAP. IX.

*Of the Kingdoms represented in Daniel
by the Ram, and the He-Goat.*

P. 115---127.

THIS Chapter, which is not so clear as to be readily understood by every one, gives us a strange Hypothesis, "That" the Ram and He-Goat, "*Dan.* viii." represent the same Kingdoms of the "*Medes and Persians*, and of the *Grecians*, with the "*Bear and Leopard*; the former from the Beginning of the four Empires, and the latter to the End of them; by which means, under the Types of these two, the Times of all the four Empires are again described." So that it seems *two* Beasts are here in a manner Equivalent to *four* Beasts; an Assertion not easily to be admitted. We are here also told, that when *Cyrus* had newly conquered *Babylon*, he revolted from *Darius*, King of the *Medes*, and beat him at *Pasargadæ*, and set up the *Persians* above the *Medes*. Of which Revolt and Conquest at this Time, as I have already noted^b, no ancient Historian, says one Word; and which *Daniel*, the Astronomical Canon, and *Xenophon* seem all to me directly to contradict. Nor does *Sir Isaac Newton*

^a P. 115.

^b P. 115, 116.

afford us here any Proof for such surprising Assertions. We are also here informed, that the *Grecian Horn*, or King of *Macedonia*, when conquered by the *Romans*, which was the fourth Empire, and so its *Dominion taken away*, became still a *little Horn that waxed great*, as belonging to the *Grecian* or third Empire; and this is built only on those few Words of *Daniel*, that this little *Grecian Horn stood up, but not by his own Power*, Ch. viii. 23. Which Horn or Empire is here ^a deduced all the Way from that Conquest of *Macedonia*, till the Advancement of the *Greek Empire* again, under *Constantine the Great*, and his Successors there; and even to this very Day, when *Sir Isaac Newton* says it is *still mighty under the Turk*. *Sir Isaac Newton* then introduces ^b the famous *Evening Morning Vision*, as belonging to this little Horn, or *Grecian* ^c Empire of 2300 Years Duration, and as taking its Date either from the Destruction of *Jerusalem* by *Titus Vespasian*, A. D. 70, or from the Building a Temple to *Jupiter Olympus*, where the *Jewish Temple* once stood, A. D. 132, or from the End of the *Jewish War*, A. D. 136, and therefore ending at the cleansing the *Jewish Sanctuary*, either A. D. 2370, or 2432, or 2436. These are Assertions so intirely new, of so strange a Nature, and of such great Consequence, as to have deserved that the strongest Evidence should have been produced for them; while no such Evidence appears. And therefore till such Evidence be produced we are at Liberty to reject them. In the mean Time, the Reader may see how much an easier Exposition this last famous Prophecy admits in my *Essay on the Revelation*, p. 235, 236, 237, to which I must refer him for Satisfaction upon this Occasion. The Translation indeed from the *Grecian* to the *Roman Times*, both in *Daniel* xi. 35, 36, and viii. 11, 12. tho' exact in Point of Time, or just

^a P. 120, &c.^b P. 122.^c P. 122—127.

at the Profanation of the Temple by *Antiochus Epiphanes*, is yet somewhat obscure in our present Copies; but this being much the same in Sir *Isaac Newton's* Transition from the Times of the *Maccabees*, to the Times of *Constantine*, no considerable Argument can be thence drawn for his Hypothesis. Nor does Sir *Isaac Newton*, in my Opinion, do well in setting down ^a the Text, *Dan. xi. 33.* from the *English* Version only, without that Distinction which it affords, that *they should fall by the Sword, and by Flame, by Captivity, and by spoil many Days*; while the Word *many*, upon which alone an Argument can be grounded against the Persecution of *Antiochus* as foretold here, is in other Characters in our Bibles, and indeed is not extant either in the *Hebrew*, or *Greek* Copies; and is by Consequence of no Authority at all.

CHAP. X.

Of the Prophecy of the seventy Weeks.

p. 128---143.

IN this Chapter we have accidentally three true and valuable Paragraphs, the first declaring Sir *Isaac Newton's* ^b firm assent to the principal System of the Scripture Prophecies, viz. That the *Israelites*, in the Days of the ancient Prophets, when the ten Tribes were led into Captivity, expected a double Return; and that at the first the *Jews* should build a new Temple, inferior to *Solomon's*, untill the Time of that Age should be fulfilled;

^a P. 126.

^b P. 132, 133.

and afterwards they should return from all Places of their Captivity, and build Jerusalem and the Temple gloriously; and that to express the Glory and Excellence of this City it is figuratively said to be built of precious Stones, and called the *New Jerusalem*, the *Heavenly Jerusalem*, the *Holy City*, the *Lamb's Wife*, the *City of the Great King*, the *City into which the Kings of the Earth do bring their Glory and Honor*. The Second contains the like Declaration of Sir *Isaac Newton's*, * that the Year of the *Jews* was *Lunisolar*, or had their Months beginning with the New Moon; yet so that their Number of Months in the Year was adjusted to the Revolution of the Sun, even ever since their coming out of *Egypt*, and ever used afterward in the Old Testament, and by *Daniel* himself. The third most ^b authentickly, and with great Sagacity states the Chronology of that important Period, from the Beginning of *Xerxes* till the Christian *Æra*, in agreement with *Ptolemy's* Canon, and all the late accurate Chronologers, within a Part of one Year in the Reign of *Xerxes* and *Artaxerxes*: Which indeed I believe was never so fully and uncontestably demonstrated before. But if any ask why Sir *Isaac Newton* ventures here to differ a Part of a Year from *Ptolemy's* Canon in the Reigns of *Xerxes* and *Artaxerxes*, by bringing *Xerxes* lower, and shortening the Reign of *Artaxerxes* to make room for it, and this without directly contradicting any Eclipse in *Ptolemy's* *Almagest*, which computes according to that Canon, I answer, that the Reason is very plain, that this is done in order to support his Hypothesis, that the Seventh of *Artaxerxes* might be a Sabbatical Year; and that thence seventy Weeks of Years=490 Years might reach to another Sabbatical Year, *A. D.* 34. on which he had a Mind to place the Death of Christ: Tho' in Reality there were no great Occasion for that Hypothesis; because

* P. 137, 138.

^b P. 139.—143.

from the same seventh Year of *Artaxerxes* in the natural State of the Canon, to *A. D.* 33. the commonly allow'd Year for the Death of Christ, there are the very same Number of 490 Years: As has a considerable time been known among the Learned. I am however the more willing to take Notice of these three valuable Branches of this Tenth Chapter of Sir *Isaac Newton's* Observations, because the main Part of it, which is Sir *Isaac Newton's* Hypothesis for the Explication of *Daniel's* LXX Weeks, is what I esteem one of the weakest Things in all his Writings; and in its own nature utterly indefensible. It was first published, and that in some Points more explicitly, by Dr. *Clarke* in his small Pamphlet Concerning the *Connexion of the Prophecies of the Old Testament*, as if it had been his own Hypothesis, *A. D.* 1725. p. 18. 41, 42. and I answered it then accordingly, in my *Supplement to the Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies*, p. 9—19. Nor indeed could Sir *Isaac Newton* or other Learned Men have fallen into so different, and such weak Explications of these LXX Weeks, as they have done, had it not been for the gross Corruptions in the Masorete Copies of *Daniel* and *Nehemiah*, which they unwarily followed; wherein the third Year of *Belshazzar* is put for what was in the Old Copies, and particularly in the Temple Copy of *Josephus*, the first Year of *Darius the Mede*: Wherein seven Weeks and sixty-two Weeks are put for seven Weeks and an half, and sixty-two Weeks and an half; the two Parts exactly making up the whole; as the Nature of the Thing required, and as the Old *African* and *Palestine* Copies in the Days of *Tertullian* and *Africanus* truly exhibited them: Wherein *Nehemiah's* Year for the Date of his Commission to build the Walls of *Jerusalem* is that of *Artaxerxes*, whereas it ought to have been that of *Xerxes* his Father; as it truly stood in the Temple Copy of *Josephus*: I say these Learned Men could not have fallen into such great

great Mistakes about these LXX Weeks, had it not been for their following the Masorete Copies in these its gross Errors. Upon the Correction whereof this most important Prophecy is now become one of the easiest to be understood; and its Completion one of the exactest of any in the Old Testament: As I have largely shewed in the Supplement before-mentioned, p. 56—75. The principal Fault has not here been in the weak Reasonings of the modern Expositors, but in the Falsehood of their Copies; which rendred a Thing very easy in it self absolutely impossible to be cleared, till the Errors of these Copies were detected, and the true original Readings restored: Which is now most happily done and that chiefly by the Help of *Ptolemy's Canon*, *Thucydides*, *Josephus*, *Tertullian*, and *Africanus*; as may be seen in the Place already quoted.

C H A P. XI.

Of the Times of the Birth and Passion of Christ. p. 144—168.

THIS is a very remarkable Chapter; and contains not only Sir *Isaac Newton's* opinion as to the Times of Christ's Birth and Passion, but a brief Epitome of the Acts of *John the Baptist* and of Christ's Ministry, or a Kind of short *Harmony of the Gospels*. It begins with an Observation * that the fixed Holydays were not appointed by the Apostles, or their early Successors, nor by any Tradition of the real Days of their Births, Deaths, or Martyrdoms, but were long afterwards ordained instead of the idolatrous Festivals among the Heathen, and were

* P. 144, 145. See p. 204, 205.

usually placed at the Sun's Ingress into the several Signs of the *Zodiack*; not indeed when these Holydays were so appointed, but when *Julius Cæsar* settled his Calendar. This Observation I well remember I heard him make about 22 Years ago, and it is a very curious and very certain Observation. See *Harm.* p. 162, 163. Nor is his next Observation to be denied, that the first Christians, *after^a the Age of the Apostles*, did not exactly know what Year our Saviour was born, or what Year he died; I mean any farther than that *John the Baptist* began to preach in the 15th Year of *Tiberius Cæsar*, and that *Christ* was about 30 Years of Age, either when he began his Ministry, or when he came to be baptized by *John the Baptist*, about the same Year. *Luc.* iii. 1,—23. To be sure those first Christians were not then much concerned about, or very skilful in either Chronology or Astronomy. But why so great a Chronologer and Astronomer as *Sir Isaac Newton*, should not, in this Age, chuse rather to determine both the Birth and Death of *Christ* by proper Characters derived from those Sciences, as all other learned Men have endeavoured to do, than from some more uncertain *Supposals* or *Suspitions* of his own, I cannot imagine. See my *Harmony of the four Evangelists*, p. 135, — 168. and p. 193, — 200. Thus that ancient Tradition derived from the *Valentinians*, that *Christ* preached a good Part of a Year at least, and yet was crucified in the 15th Year of *Tiberius*, of which I have already treated p. 156, 157 *præ*, ought surely to induce us to suppose he at least began to preach privately before that Year was over: Which yet *Sir Isaac Newton* will not allow: And which if he should allow, those five Passovers and four Years, which his peculiar *Observations*, as well as *Scaliger's* and my *chronological Determinations* agree in, would bring the last Passover and the Death of *Christ* no

lower than *A. D.* 33. where the strongest Evidence, and the general Consent of Chronologers has long placed it. Whereas Sir *Isaac Newton* in Order to bring the Death of *Christ* into a Sabbatical Year, or *A. D.* 34. supposes him not to begin to preach till the next Year, the * 16th of *Tiberius*; while yet he can neither produce any *Prophecy of the old Testament*, nor any *Testimony of Antiquity* belonging to the *New*, that the Messiah was to die, or did die on such a Sabbatical Year. Thus it is very strange that Sir *Isaac Newton*^b should set aside the certain Method of fixing the Year of *Christ's* Death from the 15th of *Nisan's* falling then on a *Friday*, which can only belong to *A. D.* 33. and should remove that Day from certain modern *Jewish* Fancies, as to the Beginning of their Months by the *Phasis*; as to the Possibility of seeing a New Moon 18 Hours after the Conjunction; as to the changing the Day, nay the Month of their Festivals according to some *Talmudical* and *Rabbinical* Rules, all unknown in the Days of *Aristobulus*, of *Christ*, and his Apostles, of *Philo* and *Josephus*, the original Witnesses; and so of no Manner of Value or Consideration in the present Case. Of which see my *Harmony* p. 193,—200. as before. Nay 'tis still more strange, that Sir *Isaac Newton* should at last endeavour to set aside all the Evidence we have for that Year *A. D.* 33. By this single Character, I give it in his own Words^c, “ that
 “ in the Passover two Years before the Passion,
 “ when *Christ* went thro' the Corn, and his Disci-
 “ ples pluckt the Ears, and rubbed them with their
 “ Hands to eat, this Ripeness of the Corn shews
 “ that the Passover fell late; and so did the Pass-
 “ over *A. C.* 32. *Apr.* 14. but the Passover *A. C.* 31.
 “ *March* 28. fell very early. It was not therefore
 “ two Years after the Year 31. but two Years after
 “ 32. that *Christ* suffered.” This rubbing of the

* P. 147.

b P. 160,—168.

c P. 167, 168.

Ears of Corn, as Sir *Isaac Newton* confesses, was near a Week after the 16th of *Nisan*, when the first Sheaf of Barley Harvest was reaped, as the first Fruits to God, *Levit. xxiii. 10, &c.* after which they reaped their Barley, and before which they were not allowed to eat Bread, nor parched Corn, nor even the green Ears, *v. 14.* implying that Barley might be ripe enough to be parched, nay to be made into Bread by that Time. And strange it is, that it should ever be reckoned absurd in Harvest Time to have Corn ripe enough to be rubbed in the hand, and eaten. Not to say farther, that if it were hardly ripe enough for such rubbing in a peculiarly cold and late Spring; yet in an ordinary one, or especially in an hot and early one, which this might be, there can be no Objection against that Year from such an Observation. These Sort of Topicks, quite out of the common Way, which Sir *Isaac Newton* frequently prefers before the most solid Arguments, and that both in his *Chronology*, and in these *Observations*, may please when they serve darling Hypotheses; but were the like Observations produced to confute them, their Author, I dare say, would look upon them as very inconsiderable: Of which we shall have an eminent Example presently. Nay one I shall now produce, not mentioned by Sir *Isaac Newton* and no Way inferior to what I just now alledg'd out of him, only on the contrary Side. It is this: He supposes the Passover, when our Saviour died*, to fall *Apr. 23. A. D. 34.* or exceeding late, and pretty near to the very Heat of Summer. Yet does St. *John* assure us, Chap. xviii. 18. that then *the Servants and Officers made a Fire of Coals; because it was cold, and warmed themselves; and that Peter stood there and warmed himself.* Which Circumstance for certain much more favours the Time of the Passover *A. D. 33.* when it fell *Apr. 3, or 21*

* P. 162, 163.

Days sooner. Nor can we well reconcile that late Passover, with this cold Weather, in the hot Climate of *Judea*. Thus we have it here taken for granted that *Matthew* and *John* only observed ^a the true Order of Time in their Gospels, while *Mark* and *Luke* did not: Altho' it be very plain that *Mark* made Use of *Matthew's* Gospel. [See *Harm.* p. 102. and *Mill. Proleg.* § 109.] and disposed it according to the Order of *Luke*; as also that *Luke*, and he alone of all the four Evangelists expressly assures us Chap. i. 3. that he *having had perfect Understanding of all Things from the very first, wrote them καθεξῆς in Order to Theophilus*. Nor does it appear to me, why *Mark* the Son of *Peter*, 1 *Pet.* v. 13. from whom he had naturally all his new Information, should not write in Order as well as any of the rest. See *Harm.* p. 97, — 115. Thus Sir *Isaac Newton* takes it also for granted, that *Christ* was crucified on the 14th of *Nisan*^b; contrary to the general Opinion; contrary to the strongest Evidence; and contrary to the express Words of the Apostles, or their *Amanuensis Clement*, in their Constitutions, not only in our Copy v. 15. but in that preserv'd by *Epiphanius*; who affirm, that *the Jews crucified Christ on their Feast Day, or on the 15th of Nisan*. See *Histor. Pref.* p. 49. Thus Sir *Isaac Newton* would gather from the Words of *Christ* in the last Year of his Ministry^c, that the *Truth* should make the *Jews* free; and from their Answer, that *they were Abraham's Seed and were never in Bondage to any Man*; that this was a *Sabbatical Year, or Year of Release*, when the Masters had just set their *Hebrew Slaves* free. Whereas that Discourse rather implies the direct contrary; that the *Jews* did not then make Slaves of any of *Abraham's Seed*, but only of *Foreigners or Proselytes*: Whom they were not bound to set free at the Year of Release. See *Exod.* xxi. 2, — 6. *Deut.*

^a P. 150. 152. 159.^b P. 160.^c P. 149.

xv. 1. — 18. *Jer.* xxxiv. 12. — 32. *Jos. Antig.* viii. 6. 3. Thus Sir *Isaac Newton* would gather from *Christ's* Parable of “ a weaker King leading his Army against a stronger,” that this was the Time when *Herod* was leading his Army thro’ *Judea*, against *Aretas* King of *Arabia*: Of which there is not the least Sign in all the Gospels; and which appears from *Josephus* to have been three or four Years later. Not to say that the Numbers of the weaker 10000 and of the stronger 20000, as well as the weaker’s sending while the stronger was yet a great Way off, an Ambassage, and desiring Conditions of Peace, no Way agree to the Circumstances of *Herod* and *Aretas*. Nor does it appear that *Herod’s* Army was inferior in Number or Strength to that of *Aretas*: But that God gave an intire Victory to *Aretas* over *Herod*, and after an uncommon Manner permitted his Army to be all cut off, in Way of a Divine Punishment for his barbarous Murder of *John the Baptist*. However Sir *Isaac Newton* should rather have concluded from this Supposal, that the Year of the Passion was three or four Years later, that it might fall at the Time when *Josephus* implies this War happened between *Herod* and *Aretas*. But this Consequence being against his darling Hypothesis that *Christ* must die on a *Sabbatical Year*, he durst not give us the natural Consequence of Things, but would rather suppose *Josephus* to be two or three Years mistaken, than part with his own Hypothesis. In the mean Time, without countenancing such uncertain Conclusions, in Contradiction to direct Evidence, I freely acknowledge that Sir *Isaac Newton’s* Observation, how *Christ* in his Parabolical Discourses was wont to allude to Things present, is, tho’ not an intirely new, yet a very true and, as here more fully than any where else insisted on^b, a very curious Observation. And I farther take the Li-

berty to mention this Rule, as that by which Sir *Isaac Newton* himself was pleased to examine the several Sections of my *Harmony of the four Evangelists*, when I shewed it him about twenty-two Years ago: To see whether what I had there determined from *Chronological Arguments*, would answer to the Seasons of the Year alluded to in these Parables. Nor do I remember that he then noted any one Disagreement: Tho' I must now confess, that my placing that Discourse of our Saviour's, which speaks of its being *four Months and then came Harvest**, in the Month of *August*, Harm. p. 514. seems an Exception to that Agreement: And I now suspect I have there placed it wrong; and that it should be placed according to Sir *Isaac Newton's* Observation nearer the Winter Solstice. See also *Primitive Christ. Reviv'd*, Vol. III. p. 41.

C H A P. XII.

Of the Prophecy of the Scripture of Truth.

p. 169—193.

THO' I have no doubt but the xi Chapter of the Book of *Daniel*, as well as the rest of the same Book is a *Scripture of Truth*; yet am I by no means satisfyed that this Chapter is peculiarly that *Scripture of Truth* which is mentioned in the End of the foregoing Chapter of *Daniel*, Chap. x. 21. whence I suppose this Title to be taken: Which rather refers to some *Scripture* now lost, than to the present Chapter: Which tho' it contain what is remarkably *the Truth* v. 2. yet could not be *written* at the Time here specified, and so could not then be a *Writing*

* See p. 147, 148.

or *Scriptures*; but was to be written by the Prophet *Daniel* afterward. Nor can I at all assent to what *Sir Isaac Newton* here says, that the third Year of *Cyrus* over *Babylon*, was the Year in which he conquered *Persia*. I suppose this to be a false Transcript for *Media*, according to *Sir Isaac Newton's* Scheme in his *Chronology* Chap. vi. p. 329, 330, 331. and before in these *Observations* p. 115. of which already p. 285, 286. *prius*. Nor indeed can I by any means interpret the first of the Kings of *Persia*, that should hereafter stand up in this Vision, Chap. xi. 2. seen expressly in the third Year of *Cyrus* King of *Persia*, xi. 1. to be the same *Cyrus*: As does *Sir Isaac Newton*. However, I so very nearly agree with *Sir Isaac Newton's* and *Porphry's*, and *Jerom's*, and every Commentator's Exposition of the first thirty Verses of this important xi Chapter of *Daniel*, as may be seen in my own Exposition of it, *Lit. Accompl. of Proph.* p. 26—41. that I shall not need to make any farther Reflexions upon it. The Prophecy does here so fully and undenyably agree to the History, that *Porphry* and all our Unbelievers to this Day have no other way to guard themselves against the Strength of the Evidence hence arising for a real prophetick Spirit in *Daniel*, but to pretend, without any proper Evidence in the World, nay against the plainest Evidence, that the Book of *Daniel* was written after the Events, and not before them. Nor is it other than a clear Case in my Opinion, that the next five Verses 31—35. belong to the Times of *Antiochus* also, a King of the third or *Grecian* Empire. How strangely, saeven *Sir Isaac Newton* applies them to what I and all others call the fourth or *Roman* Empire; by forcing the Text contrary to its natural import and coherence. I greatly prefer *Mr. Mede's* Distinction here, who does not begin the *Roman* Times till v. 36. as the Reader may see in my

Paraphrase on that Verse, in the Place already quoted; since *Antiochus* did as certainly set up an *Abomination of Desolation*, by placing abominable heathen Idols in the *Jewish Temple*, and upon the *Jewish Altar*, as did *Titus* by bringing the idolatrous *Roman Army* with the Images of their Idols into the Holy City *Jerusalem*, and close by the Holy Temple it self; and as did *Adrian* afterward, by building a Temple to *Jupiter Capitolinus*, where the Temple of God in *Jerusalem* had stood. And this is the more to be regarded, because the original History calls this first Profanation under *Antiochus* by this very Name: *In the 15th Day of the Month Casleu in the 145th Year [of the Greeks, or Seleucidæ] they set up the Abomination of Desolation upon the Altar, and builded Idol Altars throughout the Cities of Judah on every side, 1 Macc. i. 54.* So that why Sir *Isaac Newton* interprets these five Verses otherwise than the natural Coherence of the Context; the plain History of the Fact, and the constant Sense of other Interpreters oblige us to understand them, does not sufficiently appear. As for Sir *Isaac Newton's Supposals* about the Time^a and Circumstances of the Apostles leaving *Judea*, and of the Places whither they went, and the Time when *John* was banished into *Patmos*, and all in the Days of *Nero*; they seem not only intirely unsupported, but not seldom intirely contradicted by the original Testimonies of Antiquity thereto relating, and so deserve no distinct Confutation: I mean this any farther than the Time of the writing the *Apocalypse* by *John*, as stated by Sir *Isaac Newton*, will afford us presently a particular Occasion of demonstrating that it was not in the Days of *Nero*, but at the End of the Reign of *Domitian*. I say no more of Sir *Isaac Newton's* Interpretation of the *He-Goat*^b, or *Old Greek Empire* after that Empire was conquered by the Ro-

^a P. 190.^b P. 191, 192.

mans; as having spoken my Mind already concerning that Matter; and being no way apprehensive, that an Hypothesis so contrary to the Text, and to the whole Tenor of the four Monarchies, stands in need of any more distinct Confutation. I always consider the *Greek* Empire begun by *Constantine*, not as a Branch of the third or *Grecian*, but of the fourth or *Roman* Monarchy; as it evidently was, and as it has ever been considered to this Day, by all Historians. In which latter Times of the *Roman* Monarchy however, I shall not considerably differ from Mr. *Mede's* and Sir *Isaac Newton's* particular Interpretations; as will appear by my short View of the two next Chapters thereto relating; and has already appear'd in my forecited Exposition of this xi Chapter of the Book of *Daniel*.

C H A P. XIII.

*Of the King who did according to his Will,
and magnified himself above every God,
and honoured Mahuzzims, and regarded
not the Desire of Women. p. 194*
— 202.

I N this Chapter Sir *Isaac Newton* first touches upon the ancient Government of the Churches * by a Council of Presbyters in every City, and a Bishop as their President: Which, in a proper Sense, of the Dignity and Superiority of the Bishop above the Presbyters, is true: And that the Bishop and Presbyters of one City meddled not [usually] with the Affairs

* P. 194.

of another City, except by admonitory Letters or Messages: Where yet he omits what the Apostles had enjoined them, that " The Bishops of every
 " Countrey ought to know who is the chief among
 " them, and to esteem him as their head, and not
 " to do any great thing without his Consent: " &c.
 Can. Apost. XXXV. Sir *Isaac Newton* also affirms here, that the Bishops of several Cities did not meet together in Council before the Time of the Emperor *Commodus*: Where he also omits what the Apostles had farther enjoined them, " Let a Synod of
 " Bishops be held twice in the Year; and let them
 " ask one another the Doctrines of Piety; and let
 " them determine the Ecclesiastical Disputes that
 " happen. Once in the fourth Week of Pentecost;
 " and again on the twelfth of the Month *Hyperbe-*
 " *relaus*." Can. XXXVIII. Nor did I ever hear before that the Bishops then asked leave of the *Roman* Governors for such their smaller Synods: Tho' they were afterward forced to ask the Emperors own leave, or Direction rather, for the meeting of larger and more general Councils: For which Sort of Councils the Apostles had made no Provision; and which when celebrated, without any Warrant from them, and as influenced by Court-politicks, soon became the Ruin of true primitive Christianity: As Sir *Isaac Newton* rightly observes. As to the *Encratites*, and *Montanists**, and pretended *Apostolici*, and the *Hierocitæ*; as to *Paul* and *Anthony* the Hermits; together with the Superstitions and voluntary long Fastings, and Reliques, and Apparitions of supposed Saints departed, and Conjurations by the Crucifix, and dead Mens Bones, &c. and as to the Monks, who condemned Marriage, and became the celebrated Founders of *Antichristianism*, *Athanasianism*, and *Popery*; which are all here so fully and largely insisted on, and traced

through the latter half of the fourth and former half of the fifth Century by Sir *Isaac Newton*; what he says I cannot but agree to be generally very true, and very sad. But still with these Reserves, that the Order of Virgins, and the Order of Widows which had married but once, and the Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which also married but once, after their Baptism; and the solemn Fast of Passion-Week, with Abstinence from Flesh and Wine during that Time; and the half Fasts on *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*; with the annual Celebration of the Feasts of *Easter*, *Ascension*, and *Pentecost*, and the Memorials of the Martyrs, &c. which were all evidently derived from the Apostles and their Companions in the first Century, be intirely excepted from all Sir *Isaac Newton's* Imputations. Nor ought he to have refer'd the high Commendation ^a *Constantine* gave the holy Company of the Asceticks and Virgins of his Time, in *Eusebius*, to the Superstitions of the Monks: Which indeed were hardly then arisen: Tho' they soon afterward, as I fully agree, over-ran and corrupted the Churches of Christ.

CH A P. XIV.

*Of the Mahuzzims honoured by the King
who doth according to his Will. p. 203*
— 231.

THIS is, generally speaking, a most remarkable Chapter; and discovers the true and the early Origin of *Papery* among the first *Albanasians*, beyond Contradiction. Mr. *Mede* was not unacquain-

ted with this its Origin: As appears by his own Words, Op. p. 816. that "It is commonly and truly affirm'd by our Ecclesiastical Antiquaries, that before the Year 360 there is no Word to be found of the *Invocation of Saints glorified, or worshipping their Reliques*: To which I add, no not of any Miracles done by them. But presently after that Year search and you shall find: I spare to name the Authors, not willing to discover the Nakedness of the Fathers. But whoso reads them will admire to see so truly verified, what the Spirit foretold should be in *Upsilon* *καί ποτε* in the latter times." Now altho' Mr. Mede's Ignorance of the Popish and Antichristian Character of *Athanasianism* hindered him from exposing the Nakedness of such as he styles *Fathers*, Sir Isaac Newton, as throughly sensible of it, has fully discovered the Nakedness of these pretended *Athanasian Fathers*, but really of these *Athanasian* or *Antichristian Hereticks* in the latter half of the fourth, and former half of the fifth Century: Which indeed he has done to the great Satisfaction of such as love true Primitive Christianity, and to the utter Confusion of those that still support *Athanasianism* and *Popery* among us. The Perusal of which illustre Chapter I cannot therefore but earnestly recommend to all sincere Lovers of Truth, and of True Religion. Two Things only I cannot but here a little wonder at in Sir Isaac Newton, the One, that he should seem to believe that so great and good a Man as Gregory of *Neocesarea*, the Scholar and Admirer of *Origen*, in the middle of the third Century, instituted Memorials of the Martyrs, and that with this Design, that Christians might make merry, and delight themselves, and be dissolved into Joy at them; and this upon the Credit of so notorious a Legend in the latter Part of the fourth Century, as is this Gregory's Life pre-

tended to be written by *Gregory Nissen*. Of which see the Appendix to the fourth Volume of *Primitive Christianity Reviv'd*, p. 40—44. The Other is ^a, that he should understand *Cyprian* and *Felix*, about the middle of the same third Century, when they took care that “The Passions of the Martyrs should
“ be registred, in order to celebrate their Memorials annually with Oblations and Sacrifices,” as Instances of the Rise of our modern *Merriments* on Holy-days. Whereas those that are used to the Language of such early Ages well know, those Words meant then no more than the Celebration of the *Holy Communion* at those sacred Memorials of the Martyrs, and this at their *κοιμητήρια* or places of Burial: Which Memorials of the Martyrs, how much soever they were afterward perverted, are well known to have been observed by Christians as early as the Days of *Polycarp*, and of the Apostles themselves. Martyr. *Polycarp*. §. 17. 18. Constitut. v. 8. where we may also take notice of a farther Mistake of Sir *Isaac Newton*'s, as if this ancient Christian Practice of Praying to God ^b over the Sepulchres of the Martyrs, began in *Dioclesian*'s Persecution; tho' I will not deny but the Superstitions that afterward followed in those Places might be then creeping in in some Countries. Sir *Isaac Newton* himself confesses that these ancient Memorials of the Martyrs under *Dioclesian* ^c, were only the first Step towards any undue Veneration of them, and did not yet amount to an unlawful Worship: Which unlawful Worship is indeed particularly caution'd against in such Cases, in that admirable Remains of most primitive Antiquity, the Martyrdom of *Polycarp* already cited, §. 17. Nor can I at all approve of Sir *Isaac Newton*'s dogmatical Assertion ^d about the Oracle of *Apollo Daphneus* in the Suburbs of *Antioch*, when the Oracle, after the Oblation of many Sacrifices, still told Ju-

^a P. 205.^b P. 205, 206, 207.^c P. 205.^d P. 210.

lian the Pagan Emperor, that “ The Bones of the
 “ Martyr *Babylas* which were there buried hindred
 “ him from speaking.” That therefore some Christian was got into the Place where the Heathen Priests used to speak through a Pipe, in delivering their Oracles: Since ’tis certain Sir *Isaac Newton* neither knew that such Heathen Oracles were given by Priests speaking through a Pipe; nor did he, I believe, ever read that any such Pipes were found in those Heathen Temples when they were demolished by the Christian Emperors; nor that any of those Heathen Priests, when they afterward turned Christians, ever confess’d that those Oracles were delivered through such Pipes. Nor, if it were so, does any one know how a Christian should get into the Priest’s Place of that Temple, to counterfeit such an Oracle: Nor indeed was the Church at that Time become so very profane and Jesuitical, as to encourage any Christian to be guilty of so gross a Forgery. What we can well *prove* we should *affirm*, and no more: And what we and all the World know we cannot prove, but only do *suppose* or *conjecture*, should be ever set down expressly as our bare *Supposals* and *Conjectures*, but not otherwise. As to the Time when the old *real* Christian *Miracles* ceased, and the Anti-Christian *Wonders of a Lye* began, see Authent. Rec. p. 939—948. However, I cannot intirely approve of Sir *Isaac Newton*’s inference from *Anthony*’s Exhortation to two Monks at his Death, to *adhere to the Saints*, and to *remember him as a Father*: As if they implied an Exhortation to them to pray to them, or to him [at their Monuments:] The Coherence will not bear it; since he insisted at the same Time on a private Burial, and that no body but those two Monks should know where he was buried. Sir *Isaac Newton* says here that *Gregory Nazianzen*^b made his Oration in Praise

^a P. 215, 216.^b P. 220.

of *Atbanafius*, *A. D.* 373 the Year that he dyed, which I formerly fet at *A. D.* 381 eight Years later. If Sir *Isaac Newton* be in the right, that Prayer to *Atbanafius* by *Nazianzen*, Part of which is here fet down, but the Whole was formerly fet down by me in the *Authent. Rec.* p. 944, 945, may bid fair to be the first direct Prayer to a pretended Saint departed, that is now extant in Christian Antiquity. Only we may take notice, before we proceed to the second Part of this Work, that Sir *Isaac Newton's* Notion, as if the latter Part of this xi Chapter of *Daniel*, about the Worship of the *Mabuzzims*, were confined to the *Greeks*, has been here greatly prejudicial to the Christian World, in preventing his tracing the like Superstitions into the Western Empire also; whither he assures us they *quickly spread*, as he has so sagaciously and so successfully done into the Eastern.

P A R T

PART II.
REFLEXIONS
UPON
Sir ISAAC NEWTON's
OBSERVATIONS
Upon the
Apocalypse of St. JOHN.

CHAP. I.

Introduction ; *Concerning the Time when
the Apocalypse was written: [In the
Days of Nero.]* P. 235 — 253.

THE first Part of this Chapter seems to me almost intirely groundless; and I must therefore be allow'd directly to confute it; and to produce what additional Evidence I have to the contrary. I say *additional Evidence* only: Meaning not to repeat here what Arguments I have already produced in my Essay on the Book of the Revela-

tion: Where the fourth *Lemma* or *Preparatory Proposition* is this, “ The Visions contained in the “ Book of the Revelation were seen by St. *John* in “ the Isle *Patmos*, A. D. 96, six and twenty Years “ after the Destruction of *Jerusalem*.” To which Arguments I desire these two may be now super-added, which to me seem little inferior to Demonstrations. The *first* is this, that had the *Apocalypse*, wherein so much longer an Interval than a *thousand Years* is directly foretold before the general Resurrection and last Judgment, been written so early as the Days of *Nero*, the Apostles and first Christians could not possibly have expected the coming of that Resurrection and last Judgment in their own Age; as they certainly did till near the End of the first Century. See *Ess. on the Rev.* Part II. Preface Coroll. 2. p. at 130—135. The *second* Argument is, the want of any one plain Citation of, or Allusion to any Part of this Book in all the later Books of the New Testament, and particularly in the Apostolical Constitutions; wherein almost all the earlier Books are directly cited, and that very frequently also: But wherein the *Apocalypse* is not so much as once either cited or alluded to. Whence it is almost certain that the *Apocalypse* was not then published. See *Prim. Christ. Rev.* Vol. III. p. 33, 34. 223, 224. What has been of late objected to this determination by Sir *Isaac Newton*, and what Arguments have by him been used for the Days of *Nero*, are much too weak to be opposed to the foregoing and fore-mentioned Evidence. Sir *Isaac Newton* allows, that *Irenæus* is strongly against him^a; and that “ Per-
“ haps *Irenæus* might have heard from his Master
“ *Poly carp* [who had at least lived forty Years in
“ the Apostolick Age, and was made Bishop of
“ *Smyrna* by *John* himself,] that he had received
“ this Book from *John*, about the Time of *Demi-*

^a P. 235, 236.

"tian's Death, or indeed that *John* might himself
 "at that Time have made a new Publication of
 "it; from whence *Irenæus* might imagine it was
 "but newly written." The first Concession in-
 tirely gives up the Point: And the second supposes
 a double Publication of the same Book; a Thing
 never heard of, as to any Book either of the Old
 or New Testament, in all Antiquity. *Irenæus* might
 be born within ten Years of the Death of *John*. He
 was so curious as to search into the ancient Copies
 of the *Apocalypse*. He was acquainted not only with
Polycarp; who could not possibly be ignorant how
 long ago he and the rest of the Christians received
 this Book from *John*; but to be sure with many more
 of *Polycarp*'s Contemporaries, who could not much
 more than he be ignorant of the same Time. Sir
Isaac Newton truly observes, that "This Book
 "was in much Request in the first Ages^a; and
 "that he does not find any other Book of the New
 "Testament so much commented upon so early
 "as this." So that 'tis next to impossible that *I-*
renæus, who seems to have been the greatest Exa-
 miner of it, and even its oldest Copies, that then
 was in the Church, should not be able to discover
 whether the Book before him were written "Al-
 "most in his own Time, about the End of the
 "Reign of *Domitian*," as he directly affirms it was,
Ess. on the Rev. p. 33. or in the Days of *Nero*, a-
 bout thirty Years sooner; or indeed, if *Epiphanius*,
 who lived two hundred Years later than *Irenæus*,
 inform us right, about fifty Years sooner, in the
 Days of *Claudius*: That is, perhaps before any one
 Book of the New Testament was written. As
 to the same Author's Argument taken from the
 Words of *Eusebius*, (and those Words possibly ta-
 ken in part out of *Ignatius*^b *Epist. ad Tarsens.* § 3.) that
 "James was slain by Herod, Peter crucify'd, Paul

^a P. 246. 249.

^b P. 236.

beheaded,

“ beheaded, and *John* banished into an Island;” this Clause contains not a Syllable of the Times when any of these Barbarities happened. And we may almost as well gather from them that *James* was slain, as well as that *Peter* and *Paul* were put to Death at *Rome* in the Persecution wherein *John* was banished, and that under *Nero*: And still without the least Colour from the Words themselves. The like is to be said of *Tertullian*’s Assertion ^a, that *John* was put into a Caldron of boiling Oil before he was banished. Not that either of them happened under *Nero*; of which he says not a Syllable: Nor is it at all clear that *Jerom* read his Words, as they are here cited, a *Nerone* but rather *Romæ*, as the Editions I have consulted, even the last, have it in the Text; tho’ the greatest Part of the MSS. have it otherwise: The Reasons for the Preference of the Reading of *Romæ* before *Nerone* are strong: viz. the constant Sense of Antiquity that *John* was banished under *Domitian*: *Jerom*’s own Assertion of it a very few Lines before: The Coherence it self in *Tertullian*, fully agreeing with *Romæ*: And the Testimony of all his MSS. Copies, none of which have a Syllable of *Nero* in this Place. And why Sir *Isaac Newton* should style this History of *John*’s being put into a Caldron of boiling Oil before he was banished thus attested to both by *Tertullian* and *Jerom*, *Fable* or *Fiction*, I can by no means understand. As for *Arethas* ^b, and the Title of the Syriack Version of the *Apocalypse*, as seen under *Nero*, both at least I suppose four hundred Years later than *Irenæus*, they are much too late Authorities for a Fact of so great Antiquity, and so well attested to as in the Days of *Domitian*. Nor is that History in *Clement* of *Alexandria* ^c of *John*’s pursuing and recovering a young Man after he returned from *Patmos*, prove that Banishment to have been in the Days of *Nero*,

^a *Ibid.*^b P. 236, 237.^c P. 237.

but

but the direct contrary. *John* might outlive his Banishment about five Years, till the third of *Trajan*: At which Year his Death is placed in *Eusebius's* Chronicon: And the History it self intirely supposes he was then *very old and infirm*: Which was certainly true in the Days of *Trajan*, but not at all true in the Days of *Nero*, about thirty-five Years before. Nor does either *Clement* or *Eusebius* ascribe this History to the Days of *Nero*, but expressly to the Time after the Death of *Domitian*. So that this is a strong Attestation to *John's* Banishment into *Patmos*, and his seeing the *Apocalypse* there, not in the Days of *Nero*, but of *Domitian*; and this from so authentick, and so ancient, I will add so very learned an Author as *Clement* of *Alexandria* himself; one of the next for Antiquity to *Irenæus*. That the *Apocalypse* is fuller of Hebraisms ^a than *John's* Gospel I never heard before. Nor does *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, here I suppose relyed on by Sir *Isaac Newton*, say any such Thing; but only that it has several Solæcisms or Expressions different from the Purity of the Greek Tongue; as has the Gospel also. See Dr. *Mill's* *Prolegomena to his New Testament*, § 157—180. As to the false *Apocalypses* mentioned by Sir *Isaac Newton* of *Peter*, *Paul*, *Thomas*, *Stephen*, and *Elias*, as alluding early to the *Apocalypse*, and supposing it then published, I know nothing of them as extant before the End of the Reign of *Domitian*: Excepting that of *Peter*, which was no other than one of the Catholick Apocryphal Books of the New Testament now unhappily lost. And what small Remains we have left of it, to be seen in Dr. *Grabe's* *Spicilegium*, Sec. I. p. 71—77. and my Authentick Records p. 673, 674. do no way allude to our *Apocalypse*. See also *Grabe* p. 83, 84, 85. But as to *Cerintbus* and his *Apocalypse* ^b, supposed here to be written by him very early, and yet

^a P. 238.^b P. 239.

in Imitation of *John's Apocalypse* extant so early, Dr. *Grabe* has shewed in that *Spicilegium*, Sec. I. p. 312. how both *Caius's* and *Dionysius's* Words, on which *Sir Isaac Newton* here relies, make it plain, that the Book by them meant was no other than our *Apocalypse*; which some of its Adversaries had falsely pretended was the Work of the *Heretick Cerinthus*, but not of *John the Apostle*: And that accordingly there is no Evidence there ever was any such real *Apocalypse of Cerinthus* extant in the World. But as for the supposed Allusions ^a to several Things in the *Apocalypse*, by the Epistles of *Peter*, and that to the *Hebrews*; particularly those in the second Epistle of *Peter* from the 19th Verse of its first Chapter to the End, which is supposed by *Sir Isaac Newton* to be a continued Commentary upon the *Apocalypse*, I confess I am not able to see one single Allusion among them all that is plain, or remarkable; nay indeed hardly one that is in any degree probable. On the contrary I esteem the intire Defect of both Citations and Allusions to this Book in all the other Books of the New Testament, how late soever some of them were written, as I have noted alreedy, p. 324 prius to be a clear Indication that this Book was not then extant among Christians. As to the Truth and Authority of the *Apocalypse* ^b, here vouch'd for by *Sir Isaac Newton*, I have my self no Doubt about it. Nor does it appear to me that any ancient Christian doubted of it till A. D. 210. when *Caius*, and soon after him *Dionysius of Alexandria* took a Prejudice against one of the most important Doctrines therein contained, that of the *Millennium*; and hunted about for Arguments to disgrace it. See *Mill's Prolegom.* § 157—180. What Intimations we have in the next Place ^c of *Sir Isaac Newton's* Sentiments about the two Prophetical Witnesses; the Palm-bearing Company; the Stone cut out of a

^a P. 239—247.^b P. 246—249.^c P. 250, 251.

Mountain without Hands; an Angel preaching the everlasting Gospel, before *Babylon* falls, and the Son of Man reaps his Harvest; the Ascent of the two Prophetick Witnesses up to Heaven in a Cloud; and the Obscurity of the *Apocalypse* till lately, with its Beginning now to be understood; these Things are too imperfectly opened here, or some of them, so far as they are opened, too near to Truth in my own Opinion also, to make it proper for me to enter deep into any farther Reflexions on them. Those who peruse my *Essay* on this Book of the *Revelation* written twenty-seven Years ago, and the Corrections made to it nine Years ago in my *Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies*, p. 93 — 113. both, as I take it, written since Sir *Isaac Newton* wrote this Treatise now before us; will easily understand my Thoughts concerning these Particulars. Only I cannot forbear declaring some Concern that ^a Sir *Isaac Newton* should esteem *Daniel's Stone cut out of the Mountain without Hands*, to be a Person or Kingdom yet intirely future: Since I thought all Christian Interpreters, and even *Josepbus* the Jew or *Ebionite* himself, had justly agreed that this Stone was no other than the *Messiah* himself, our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and that his Kingdom began long ago at his Resurrection from the Dead. But that Sir *Isaac Newton* should here call it the the *Folly* of Interpreters to endeavour to foretel ^b Events to come by this or any the like Prophecies, as if they did thereby affect to appear to be themselves *Prophets*, is wholly groundless, and throughly confuted by Sir *Isaac Newton's* own Procedure. If any honest Christian that believes the Prophecies to be inspired, endeavours to the best of his Abilities, joined to his hearty Prayers to God for Illumination, to understand those Prophecies; and if some of those Prophecies have explicit Dates and Numbers, he

^a P. 250.^b P. 251.

cannot avoid examining into those Dates and Numbers; and this certainly without the least Pretence to his being a *Prophet* himself. If upon Examination, any one thinks he hath discovered the ten Kingdoms of the *Roman* Empire, foretold both by *Daniel* and *John*, and when the last of them arose and compleated that Number; whose Duration is known from them both to be 1260 Years; he cannot easily avoid thinking he hath discovered when that Period will end. Nor can Sir *Isaac Newton* well avoid making the like Discovery of his Opinion for the End of the 2300 Years in *Daniel*; when, as we have seen, p. 303. *prius*, he supposes them to be solar Years or very nearly so, and dates them either at *A. D.* 70. or 132. or at the latest 136. The Consequence being thence too obvious to be concealed, that they will end, either at *A. D.* 2370. or 2432. or at the latest 2436. Yet do not I imagin that Sir *Isaac Newton* did at all hereby pretend to be himself a *Prophet*. Nor is the Case otherwise as to his Supposal, that the 1260 Years of the Papal temporal Authority began about *A. D.* 794. it being thence undeniable, that he expected those Years to end about *A. D.* 2054. Nor indeed is the Case much different in the Examination of Prophetick Numbers already past, and fulfilled; but not well understood. And Sir *Isaac Newton* may be almost as well accused of pretending to be a *Prophet* by his Exposition of *Daniel's* LXX Weeks, or other obscure Numbers in other Prophets; and consequent Determination when they did end; as by any Interpreter's Endeavour to expound such Numbers as are not yet ended, but relate to Futurity. In both Cases there may be no more than an honest and sincere Endeavour, under the divine Blessing, to read the Prophecies with Judgment and Understanding; and to discover the hidden Mysteries therein contained for our own and others Satisfaction, Edification and Comfort: which

which Labour, *John* Apoc. i. 3. and xxii. 7. allows to be a *blessed* Thing. Of which *Blessedness* Sir *Isaac Newton* has taken more Pains to be a Partaker than most others ever did before him; and ought not therefore to discourage any other Learned Men from labouring to obtain some Part of the same *Blessedness*.

C H A P. II.

Of the Relation which the Apocalypse of JOHN hath to the Book of the Law of Moses, and to the Worship of God in the Temple. P. 254 — 275.

ALTHO' the *Jewish* Temple wherein the Law of *Moses* was repositied, and that Temple Service be no doubt frequently alluded to in the *Apocalypse*; as Mr. *Mede*, Sir *Isaac Newton*, and all Commentators agree: And altho', by Consequence, no small Part of this Chapter be very true, and of very great Value, yet does it seem to me that Sir *Isaac Newton* has therein carryed this Matter farther than it will bear; and farther than any good Evidence can support him. He seems to me to have ventured much more than a cautious Man ought to do, in depending on many Circumstances of that Temple Worship derived only from later Talmudical or Rabbinical Writers, which are of very little Authority. Which whole Matter therefore will very well deserve an exact Review by some of the Learned hereafter. I do not my self pretend to Skill enough in those and in the more authentick Records thereto belonging, to perfect this Work to my own Satisfaction. So I let it pass: And proceed to the following Chapter.

CHAP. III.

Of the Relation which the Prophecy of JOHN bath to those of DANIEL, and of the Subject of the Prophecy. P. 276.

—307.

THAT there is a near Relation between some Prophecies in *Daniel*, and others in the *Apocalypse*, is very obvious, and well known. Mr. Mede and all judicious Interpreters perpetually take Notice of it. Nor is there that I see any thing so considerable in Sir *Isaac Newton's* Parallelism of those Prophecies, as to require particular Reflexion. So I proceed to say a few Words concerning what Sir *Isaac Newton* has advanc'd as to the Subject of the *Apocalypse*. I say a few Words only. For he seems to me here either so obscure, or sometimes so different in his Notions from what Mr. Mede and such as follow him think to be the meaning of these Visions, and especially as to the Completions of the Dates, and Numbers contained in this Book, that it would require no small Pains to examin the Particulars to the Bottom. As to my own Judgment about this Chapter, it seems to me, that when Sir *Isaac Newton* follows or improves upon Mr. Mede's Foundations and Expositions which are by far the best, generally speaking, of what have hitherto appear'd, I mean in the Seals and Trumpets; he is himself commonly to be followed; but when he leaves his Guidance, and proposes new Expositions of his own, he does not give equal Satisfaction. Thus when Sir *Isaac Newton* applies the Epistles to the seven Churches of *Asia* to seven Periods of the Church

Univer-

Universal: When he interprets the *Nicolaitans* of the *Encratites*: When he expounds the Dragon and the two-horned Beast of the *Constantinopolitan* Empire: The Image of the Beast of a [General] Council: The Hour, and Day, and Month, and Year, belonging to the sixth Trumpet, as beginning with *Olub Aflans* first Conquest of the Nations upon *Euphrates*, *A. D.* 1063, and ending with the taking of *Constantinople*, *A. D.* 1453. when he supposes the Woman or Church which fled into the Wilderness, and was there nourished 1260 Years, to be carryed to *Babylon*, and there commencing the Great Whore, and living in Splendor and tyrannizing for 1260 Years together: With many other the like strange Interpretations, without any Proofs offered for the same, I can no way give my assent to them: tho' I am not disposed to afford them an operose Confutation. Those who have a Mind to see somewhat like a Key to several of these Notions of *Sir Isaac Newton*, may find it in the Conclusion of *Dr. Clarke's* small Book about the Prophecies already cited, *p.* 44. tho' the *Dr.* has not added any considerable Evidence for those Hypotheses; and so what he says does not require any particular Examination. I rather chuse to conclude my Reflexions on this Chapter, and on this intire Treatise, with *Sir Isaac Newton's* excellent Conclusion of his first Chapter of this second Part: To which I give my hearty Approbation: And cannot but recommend it to the serious Consideration of every Christian Reader.

“ As the few and obscure Prophecies concerning
 “ *Christ's* first coming were for setting up the Chri-
 “ stian Religion, which all Nations have since cor-
 “ rupted; so the many and clear Prophecies con-
 “ cerning the Things to be done at *Christ's* second
 “ Coming, are not only for predicting, but also for
 “ effecting a Recovery and Re-establishment of the
 “ long lost Truth, and setting up a Kingdom where-
 “ in dwells Righteousness. The Event will prove
 “ the

“ the *Apocalypse*: And this Prophecy thus proved
 “ and understood, will open the Old Prophets;
 “ and all together will make known the True Re-
 “ ligion and establish it. For he that will under-
 “ stand the Old Prophets must begin with [*Daniel*
 “ and] this. But the Time is not yet come for
 “ Understanding them perfectly: Because the main
 “ Revolution predicted in them is not yet come
 “ to pass. *In the Days of the Voice of the seventh An-*
 “ *gel when he shall begin to sound, the Mystery of God*
 “ *shall be finished, as he hath declared to his Servants the*
 “ *Prophets; and then, The Kingdoms of this World*
 “ *shall become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and his Christ;*
 “ *and he shall reign for ever.* Apoc. x. 7. xi. 15.
 “ There is already so much of the Prophecy ful-
 “ filled, that as many as will take Pains in this Study
 “ may see sufficient Instances of God's Providence:
 “ but then the signal Revolutions predicted by all
 “ the Holy Prophets will at once both turn Mens
 “ Eyes upon considering the Predictions, and
 “ plainly interpret them. Till then we must con-
 “ tent our selves with interpreting what hath been
 “ already fulfilled.

“ Amongst the Interpreters of the last Age, there
 “ is scarce one of Note who hath not made some
 “ Discovery worth knowing: And thence I seem
 “ to gather that God is about opening these Myste-
 “ ries. The Success of others put me upon confi-
 “ dering it: And if I have done any Thing which
 “ may be useful to following Writers I have my
 “ Design.”

— *Illud pro certo habens, nisi in hisce talibus libe-*
rius paulò sentiendi, imò & errandi, venia concedatur,
ad profunda illa & latentia veritatis adyta viam nun-
quam patefactum iri. Mede Comment. Apoc. Præf.

Jan. 19. 1733-4.

WILL. WHISTON.

Addenda & Corrigenda.

PAGE 10 col. 1. Line 16 read *ἰπέλιπε*.
 P. 46 l. 5 r. 1360.
 P. 61 l. 2 *Add*,

N. B. It is not improper to Note here, that it might well be owing to the like *Ebionite Impositions* that *Josephus* has taken so little Notice of, (1) The Decree of *Augustus Cæsar* as to the *Enrolment* or *Taxation* of the *Roman Empire*: (2) Of the Distinctness of the *two* *Enrolments* or *Taxations* in *Judea*, the *first* under *Saturinus*; the *Second* under *Cyrenius* or *Quirinius*, the *Presidents* of *Syria*: The *First* before the *Death* of *Herod*; the *Second* after the *Banishment* of *Archelaus*. (3) Of *Prophecies* enquired into concerning a *New King* or the *Messias* to be born about the *Time* of the former *Enrolment*: (4) Of the *Resolution* of the *Jewish* *Wise-Men*, that this *New King*, the *Messias*, was to be born at *Bethlehem*: (5) Of the *Birth* of *Jesus* of *Nazareth* about the same *Time*, at *Bethlehem*, of the *Virgin Mary*: (6) And chiefly of the *Slaughter* of the *Infants* there by *Herod*. These were *Facts* of great *Consequence* to *Catholic Christianity*, and the *Evangelical History*; but ^a intirely omitted in the *Ebionite* or *Josephus's Gospel*; and the *Birth* of the *Messias*; of a *Virgin*, directly contrary to the *Ebionite* *Notion*: So that an *explicit Account* of all of them was hardly to be expected in an *Ebionite*

^a *Grabe Spicileg. Sec. I. p. 27.*

Historian. Yet are there obscure Traces or Footsteps of most of these Occurrences in *Josephus*: As will appear by the Observations following.

(1) *Josephus* informs us, that about nine Months before the Eclipse of the Moon^a, *March* 13. in the 4th Year before the Christian *Æra* or A. P. J. 4710. as we shall prove presently, *i. e.* about a Year and Quarter before the Death of *Herod*, an Oath of Fidelity was imposed on all the *Jews*, both to *Cæsar* and to *Herod*; of which we have no other Example in all *Josephus*. This seems to have been in Consequence of that *Decree of Cæsar Augustus* mentioned by *St. Luke*^b for an universal *Enrolment* or *Taxation* of his Empire; at which such an Oath might easily be administred.

(2) That about the very same Time certain pretended Prophets^c, of the Sect of the *Pharisees*, foretold to the Court Ladies, that God had Decreed to bring the Kingdom of *Herod* and his Posterity to an End; and that a *New King* should arise of the Posterity of *Pheroras* and his Wife: That this *New King* should have every thing in his power, and, what is as strange as the Birth of a Virgin, that he should look upon *Bagoas*, a Court Eunuch, as his Father, and Benefactor, and should enable him to marry and beget Children.

(3)^d That *Herod* at the same Time and on the same Occasion slew the obnoxious Part of the *Pharisees* herein concern'd; with *Bagoas* the Eunuch, and one *Carus*, who at that Time was celebrated for Beauty, and was King *Herod's* Darling and *Catamite*.

(4) Nay, what is most remarkable, That he at the same Time^e slew all those of his own Family who consented to this *Pharisaical Scheme of a New King*, in Opposition to *Herod* and his Posterity, and were for

^a *Antiq.* XVII. 2. 4.
Ibid.

^b *Luc.* II. 1.

^c *Jos.* *Ibid.*

^d *Jos.*

^e *Jos.* *Ibid.*

translating the Kingdom to the Posterity of his Brother *Pheroras*. These two last are so plain Intimations of that terrible Slaughter which was now occasioned by the Birth of the *real King of the Jews*, and which *Augustus* had heard took in one of *Herod's* own Sons, as *Macrobius* informs us, ^a (which is not impossible to have been literally true also,) that 'tis very strange it has hitherto been taken so little Notice of. This shews also that there must have been a greater Occasion for *Herod's* Cruelty here than the *Ebionites* had informed *Josephus* of, relating to the Court Ladies and *Pheroras* only, and indeed no other than the Birth of the *Messias*, that *real King of the Jews* whom he and his Son *Antipater* were so greatly afraid of, as likely to deprive them both of their Kingdom, either in Possession or Reversion.

(5) That these things all happened, for certain, under *Sentius Saturninus* ^b, the same President of Syria under whom *Tertullian's* Copies or Records truly placed that *Enrolment* or *Taxation* of *Cæsar Augustus*, which preceded the Nativity of *Jesus Christ*; as we shall see presently.

(6) That very soon afterward *Quintilius Varus* succeeded *Sentius Saturninus* ^c, as President of Syria; and continued for full ten Years; 'till *Archelaus* was banished. Under whom we have not a Word of any *Enrolment* or *Taxation*, either in *Judea* or elsewhere.

(7) That after the Banishment of *Archelaus*, *Cyrenius* or *Quirinius* succeeded *Quintilius Varus* ^d, as President of Syria, under whom *Josephus* informs us, and all agree the *Jewish Enrolments* or *Taxations* were compleated.

(8) That there are several Marks or Indications, both in *St. Luke* and *Josephus*, that they both knew

^a Harm. p. 160.
^d XVIII. 1.

^b *Jos. Antiq.* XVII. 5. 2.

^c *Ibid.*

these *Enrolments* or *Taxations* under *Saturninus* and under *Cyrenius* were really different, and indeed made at different times. *St. Luke* calls the former^a the *first* *Enrolment* or *Taxation*; which directly implies there was a *Second*. He farther implies, that the former was a very peaceable one, when *all went to be enrol'd or taxed quietly every one to his own City*^b; as does *Josephus* also distinctly assure us; and that it was by the Persuasion of the High Priest^c, the Son of *Boethus*, that the *Jews* did then so intirely acquiesce under it. 'Tis true, *Josephus* seems here to be a little mistaken when he says, this High Priest was *Joazar* [and not *Simon*] the Son of *Boethus*; and supposes this first *Enrolment* to have been in the Days of *Cyrenius* the President^d; contrary to his own account elsewhere; when he assures us, that *Joazar* was turned out of the High Priesthood^e, at the Solicitation of the *Jews*, several Years before, by *Archelaus*; *Josephus* also twice calls these Impositions ἀπολιμήσεις or ἀπογεγραφαί^f *Enrolments* or *Taxations* in the plural Number: Which most naturally implies they were more than one. Besides this, he takes notice of their πέρας or *Conclusion* under *Quirinius*; when the Seditions began, in the Days of the *Enrolment* or *Taxing* under *Judas the Galilean* or *Gaulonite*^g, but speaks also of the State of the People καὶ ἀρχάς, at their *Commencements*, when the High Priest prevented any Disturbance on that Account. All which Circumstances evidently distinguish these two *Enrolments* or *Taxations* asunder.

N. B. Since the forementioned Eclipse of the Moon, *March* 13th in the 4th Year before the Christian *Aera* A. P. J. 4710. with the Death of *Herod* some Months after it, are among the

^a Luc. II. 2.

^b v. 3.

^c Antiq. XVIII. 1. 1.

^d Vid. de Bell. II. 8. 1.

^e Antiq. XVII. 6. 4. & 9. 1. & 13. 1.

^f Antiq. XVIII. 1. 1. & 2. 1.

^g *AE*. v. 37.

principal Foundations for determining the Chronology of our Saviour *Christ*; and since withal it is frequently taken for granted, not only that *Herod's* Death was *before* the next Passover, but that the Sedition of the *Jews* at *Archelaus's* first Passover, was *at* that next Passover also, or a single Month after that Eclipse; I shall here endeavour to *demonstrate* the Impossibility of that last Hypothesis; and also to discover, in some measure, the Duration of the several Intervals between this Eclipse and that Passover, in the Manner following; and all as given us by *Josephus*: Referring the Astronomical Reader to that Calculation of this Eclipse, which he may find after my Astronomical Lectures, p. 451, 452. (Edit. Lat.)

Moon Eclipsed *March* 13th.

The Day before this Eclipse *Matthias* and his Scholars who pulled down *Herod's* Golden Eagle, were burnt alive.

After which Eclipse

- | | Days |
|--|------|
| (1) <i>Herod's</i> terrible Disease increas'd, and he burnt <i>slowly</i> ; perhaps for about a Month. | 30 |
| (2) He called in the Physicians, and followed their Advice in all Things: Perhaps for about a Month. | 30 |
| (3) He went from <i>Jericho</i> to the Baths at <i>Callirrhoe</i> beyond <i>Jordan</i> , at about sixteen Miles Distance, and used them, and returned to <i>Jericho</i> . This might take up two Months. | 60 |

U u 2

(4) He

- (4) He grew melancholy, and sent Letters }
for all the chief of the *Jews* out of e- }
very City. They come to *Jericho*; } 30
and are imprisoned in the Hippo-
drome. This might take up a
Month.
- (5) *Herod's* Embassadors, that were sent }
to *Rome* a little before the Eclipse }
sent Letters from *Rome*: Upon the } 30
Receipt of them he recovered a lit-
tle, perhaps for a Month.
- (6) He relapsed and attempted to kill him- }
self perhaps in about } 20
- (7) He made his last Will; killed *Antipa-* }
ter; and in five Days he died. (a- }
bout the End of *September*, at the } 5
latest.)

Sum

185

- (8) His Death was conceal'd by *Alexas* and }
Salome, perhaps for } 4
- (9) The solemn Preparation for his mag- }
nificent Funeral required about three } 90
Months.
- (10) His Funeral went 200 Furlongs, at 8 }
Furlongs a Day, to *Herodium*; and } 30
returned; in about a Month.
- (11) *Archelaus* mourned seven Days; and }
gave a Funeral Feast to the People, }
which was always a very great one. } 14
These together might take up a
Fortnight.
- (12) He appeared in publick, and received }
the Compliments of the Nobility, }
and the Acclamations of the People. }
He promised the People great } 21
Things, and they expected more.
This might require about three
Weeks.

(13) Seditious Motions of the People became great, and defy'd all Attempts to heal them, before the Passover. } 30
I allow a Month.

	Sum	193
	+	185
Which in all amounts to about } thirteen Months.	=	378

Now that the former Branch of this Calculation, till the Death of *Herod*, which will be chiefly disputed, is not here very wide from the Truth, we are farther secur'd by the Interval in *Josephus* between *Herod's* sending his Embassadors to *Rome*, 1300 Miles, upon the Imprisonment of *Antipater*^a, a little before the Eclipse; and his receiving their Letters back another 1300 Miles, some time before his Death. Now tho' we need not allow more than two Months for the sending private Letters to *Rome*, and receiving their Answers, as I shall do presently; yet may double that Time or more be well allow'd for the like Journey and Return of the Dispatches of publick Embassadors. So that there might be five or even six Months from the Eclipse to the Death of *Herod*; as I have estimated this interval in the Computation. But how all the Actions and Occurrences between the Eclipse and the Death of *Herod*, nay and even the first Passover under *Arche-laus* can possibly be crouded into a *single Month*, as is commonly done by Chronologers, I do by no means understand.

Corollary (1) Since therefore we have such considerable Evidence that *St. Luke*, as well as *Josephus*, were appriz'd of the different Times and Actors, and Circumstances of these two *Enrolments* or *Tax-*

^a Antiq. XVII. 5. 7. 8.

ations, under *Saturninus*, and under *Cyrenius*; and since the Copies or Records of the oldest of the Latin Fathers ^a, *Tertullian*, rightly placed that belonging to *Christ's* Birth under *Sentius Saturninus*; while the Copies of *Justin Martyr*, and all our modern Copies and Versions, by Mistake, place it under *Cyrenius*; I cannot but strongly suspect those Copies of *St. Luke* to be here imperfect, and that his Text originally ran thus, Ἀυτὴ ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο Σαῦρενιῳ, δευτέρα δὲ ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίῳ. *This first Enrolment was made when Saturninus; but the second when Cyrenius was President of Syria.* Which reading would absolutely take away the greatest of all the historical or chronological Difficulties in the whole New Testament. See *Valesius's* Notes on *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. I. 5.*

Coroll. (2) Hence we learn, and that from *Astronomy* and *Josephus* History themselves, compared with the Gospels, the very Year, and, in a good Degree, the very Time of the Year when the first *Enrolment* under *Saturninus* was made; when the Infants were slain by *Herod*; and, by consequence, what came between them, when *Jesus Christ* was born. That Birth of our Saviour must therefore, by these Accounts in *Josephus*, be at least *nine* Months before the Eclipse of the Moon; I mean *two* Months allow'd for the Dispatch of *Antipater's* Letters, a little after the foregoing Transactions, and for the Return of their Answers for calling him to *Rome* ^b; and *seven* Months, express in *Josephus*, for his Absence from *Judea* in that Journey: Which together make up those *nine* Months. So that *Christ* must have been born, by this Chronology, as early as the middle of *June*, in the 5th Year before the Christian *Æra* A. P. J. 4709. And because this Time well agrees to the fourteen Months after the Conception of *John* the Baptist,

^a Contr. Marcion. IV. 9. Apolog. I. 44.
2. 4. and 6. 4. with 4. 3.

^b Antiq. XVII.

upon his Father *Zacharias's* Course in the Temple, the Middle of *April*, the Year before: As may be gathered from the Calculations in my *Harmony*, p. 155. — 158. I the more securely depend upon it.

Coroll. (3) *Christ* must therefore have gone into *Egypt*, upon the coming of the Wise Men to *Bethlehem*, soon after the Purification, about the End of *July*, in the same 5th Year before the Christian *Æra*: He must have staid there till the Death of *Antipater* and *Herod*, who both sought the young Child's Life^a, almost a Year and two Months: He must have been about thirty two Years and four Months Old when he began his Ministry: And he must have been full 36 $\frac{1}{4}$ Years Old when he was crucified. All which I now take to be the true State of the Chronology of *Christ's* Life, from the most authentick Testimonies extant in all Antiquity.

Coroll. (3) Hence we may learn who those were that are called *Herodians* in the Gospels^b; which has not hitherto been clearly discovered: I mean that they were such as thought *Herod Antipas*, or some of *Herod* the Great's Family, would prove that mighty Prince whom *Josephus* assures us many of their Wise Men expected in that Age to arise of Jewish Parents, but who, as he thought, was to be set up in *Judea* only. I do not mean the *Jews Messias*, as has hitherto been supposed, but rather that great King whom probably they supposed God would send before the Face of the *Messias*, in order to subdue the Heathen Nations, and so prepare the political World for his Reception. See p. 72. 73. prius. This Account of the *Herodians* is suggested by the Pharisaical Prediction already mentioned of the Translation of the Kingdom from *Herod* the Great, to *Pheroras* his Posterity, still in the same Family of *Antipater*; and this about the End of *Daniel's* LXX Weeks, according to the Chronology of that Age.

^a *Mat.* II. 20.

^b *Matt.* xxii. 16. — 22. *Mar.* iii. 6. xii.

13. — 17. *Luc.* xx. 19. — 26.

Of which See *Suppl. to Lit. Accompl. of Propb.* p. 85. 91. 92. Nor is it unworthy of our Observation here, that these *Herodians* would naturally join with those *Pharisees* that were the *fourth* Sect of the *Jews* in *Josepbus*^a; I mean the Followers of *Judas* the *Galilean* or *Gaulonite*; who opposed all paying of Taxes to the *Romans*; and prefer'd the Dominion of *Herod's* Posterity: (who, if not *Jews* by Birth, were yet *Profelytes* of Justice to the Jewish Law and Religion; i. e. all one with *Jews* by Birth,) to any Degree of Slavery under the *Romans*: Who, without the least Question, were intirely *Pagans* and *Idolaters*: As the very learned *Calmet* has shewn these *Herodians* did. Nor would the *Pharisees* take the Oath enjoyn'd, which included Obedience to *Cæsar*, as well as to *Herod*; tho' most of them had not scrupled to take the Oath to *Herod* himself before^b, as *Josepbus* assures us.

Coroll. (3) This is farther confirm'd from the great Difference, I have shewn both from *St. Luke* and *Josepbus*, there was in the Conduct of the *Jews* under the two *Enrolments* or *Taxations*; the former under *Herod*, their own King; the latter under *Cyrenius*, the *Roman* President: While the High Priest and the People, like true *Herodians*, intirely acquiesc'd under the former; but brake out into open Rebellion under the latter. Which most remarkable Difference is the strongest Confirmation of the present Hypothesis: And which Hypothesis is *vice versa* the strongest Confirmation of the most remarkable Difference there was between those two *Enrolments* or *Taxations*.

Page 76 line 24 read *no fewer than 80.*

P. 78 l. 20 r. [*third*] Book.

P. 79 l. 11 add, *vid. Eund. in Palæstin.* p. 277 and 278, with this Note;

^a XVIII. 1. 1. 6.

^b XVII. 2. 4. XV. 10. 4.

[Mr. Reland's Observation, when he here intimates that *Josephus never once* used such Expressions concerning the Miracles of the Old Testament, as *Let everyone think of them as he pleases*, in his seven Books of the Wars of the *Jews*, is certainly true. For I have lately my self read all those Books over several times, with some Care, and made my self the same Observation also.

P. 93 l. ult. add. See also Antiq. V. i. 18.

P. 116 l. 9 r. *Old Testament*.

P. 155 set the Numbers in the third Column every one a Line lower.

P. 156 l. 25 r. *he thought*.

P. 161 l. 26 r. *Numbers. ibid. l. 29 add.*

N. B. Tho' *Paulus Diaconus* be a Writer of the VIIIth Century, and so later than the Limits I had proposed to my self for the Old Testimonies, yet because he lived while *Phlegon's* Olympiads were extant; and seems to have taken his Citation at the first hand from *Phlegon* himself; and withal hints at other *Greek* Writers that had attested the same Thing, I shall set down his Testimony distinctly; which is subjoin'd to his Repetition of *Orosius's* Testimony already recited. See *Paul. Diac. Histor. L. VII.*

Nonodecimo anno Tiberii hæc facta referuntur. Scribens inter cæteros autem & Phlegon, qui Olympiadas super ipsis enumerat, in tertio decimo sermone eisdem verbis asserit hæc. " Porro quarto anno ducentessimæ secundæ Olympiadis facta est defectio solis maxima, & nox hora sexta diei facta "

In the XIXth Year of *Tiberius* these Things are related to have happened. And *Phlegon* among the rest, who besides gives us the Number of the Olympiads, and writing his XIIIth Book has this Assertion *verbatim*. " Now in the IVth Year of the CCII^d Olympiad there was a very great

“ *ta est: Ita ut etiam stel-* “ great Eclipse of the
 “ *læ in cælo apparerent.* “ Sun, and Night came
 “ *Terræ motus etiam mag-* “ on at the VIth Hour
 “ *nus in Bithynia factus,* “ of the Day; insomuch
 “ *plurimam Niceæ partem* “ that the Stars appeared
 “ *urbis subvertit?* “ in the Sky. There
 “ was also a great Earth-
 “ quake in *Bithynia*,
 “ which threw down a
 “ great Part of the City
 “ *Nice.*

P. 165 l. 6 r. *then, that.* l. 33 r. 23.

P. 169 l. 29 r. *γῆν.*

P. 187 l. 25 r. 1630.

P. 195 l. 15 r. *Antiquity.*

P. 200 l. 5 r. 21^d. 13^h. 7ⁱ.

N. B. From p. 201 to 208 the Numbers are wanting; but without any Defect in the Copy, or Coherence or Signatures.

P. 210 l. 10, 11. r. *Family.*

P. 213 l. 7 add, *And which Art of Surveying he would naturally teach the Israelites: As accordingly we find them exercising it, when Joshua sent such able Surveyors or Geometricians to Describe or Survey the Land of Canaan. See Joseph. Antiq. V. 1. 21.*

P. 216 l. 20 r. *that Epccha.*

P. 218 l. 25 r. 700.

P. 224. 225. 229, 230. for *A. D. r. A°.*

P. 232 l. 23 r. *may be added.*

P. 237 l. 19 r. *fifth.*

P. 238 l. 9 r. *three.*

P. 241 l. *penult. r. Mnemon.*

P. 243 l. 13 r. 10^d. 3^h. 12ⁱ.

P. 245 l. 4 r. *and Isaiah.*

P. 249 l. 36 r. *March 14th.*

P. 261 l. 3 add, *excepting the Correspondent Year 1718.*

P. 340 l. 11 *dele a Month,* r. 10 Days. l. 23. r. 34 Days.

P. 342 at the Bottom r. *Contr. Marcion IV. 19. Just. Apolog. I. 44.*

P O S T

POSTSCRIPT.

SOME Time after I had written the foregoing Papers, and they were almost all printed off, and in a Manner ready for Publication, I was made sensible that the Valentinian Notion already mentioned, p. 156, 157. that *Christ's* intire Ministry, whether private or publick, lasted but about *a single Year*, the 15th of *Tiberius*, began to be reviv'd; and that this Notion was confidently ascrib'd to many of the earliest Catholick Fathers themselves also. I thought fit therefore to add here this *Postscript* for its Confutation; and for the Vindication of those Catholick Fathers from such an unjust Imputation.

Now that our Saviour's Ministry lasted much longer than *a Year*, nay than two or three Years will I think be *demonstrated* by the five following internal Arguments, or Computations; even without recourse had to those many other strong Chronological Characters by which I long ago proved the same thing, in my *Harmony of the four Evangelists*, p. 135—200.

I. The *Journeys* of our Saviour during his Ministry, (such I mean as are mentioned in the Gospels; for many more there might be;) all made on foot; and usually among a Multitude; and while he commonly taught them, and healed them, and wrought Miracles before them all the way; are in number 33. as any one may count them from the *Epitome* of that Harmony, p. 512—536. Now from Mr. *Re-land's* most accurate Determination in his *Palæstina*, and the largest Map thereto belonging, the following Numbers of Geographical Miles for those several thirty three Journeys will be found near the Truth.

	<i>Miles</i>
(1) From <i>Nazareth</i> to <i>Bethabara</i> :	30
(2) To <i>Cana</i> in <i>Galilee</i> :	34
(3) To <i>Capernaum</i> :	25
(4) To <i>Jerusalem</i> , to the first Passover:	70
(5) To the Territory of <i>Judæa</i> : Suppose	20

N. B. Hitherto eight Months were over since the first Passover, and only four Months remained till the next Passover or Harvest. *Job. ii. 13.* with *iv. 35.*

(6) To <i>Cana</i> in <i>Galilee</i> :	70
(7) To <i>Jordan</i> , to <i>John</i> the Baptist:	30
(8) To the Wildernels, to the Temptation:	30
(9) To <i>Jerusalem</i> , to the second Passover:	10
(10) To <i>Nazareth</i> :	50
(11) To <i>Capernaum</i> :	20
(12) To a certain City: Suppose	10
(13) To the Desert [of <i>Bethsaida</i>]:	13
(14) To <i>Capernaum</i> :	6
(15) To <i>Nain</i> :	20
(16) To the Desert: [of <i>Bethsaida</i>]	26
(17) To <i>Capernaum</i> :	6
(18) To <i>Nazareth</i> :	20
(19) To the Desert [of <i>Bethsaida</i>]	26
(20) To <i>Capernaum</i> :	6
(21) To the Borders of <i>Tyre</i> and <i>Sidon</i> :	34
(22) To the Desert [of <i>Bethsaida</i>]	40
(23) To <i>Bethsaida</i> :	4
(24) Towards <i>Cæsarea Philippi</i> :	20
(25) To <i>Capernaum</i> :	20
(26) Beyond <i>Jordan</i> :	40
(27) To <i>Galilee</i> :	40
(28) To <i>Jerusalem</i> and <i>Bethany</i> :	70
(29) Beyond <i>Jordan</i> :	36
(30) To <i>Bethany</i> :	36
(31) To the City <i>Ephraim</i> :	8

(32) [To Galilee:]	60
(33) To Jerusalem, to the last Passover:	70
Sum	1000

These 1000 Geographical Miles are full 1100 English measured or Statute Miles; and at ten Miles a Day they require 110 Days. This Number 110 must also be increased above one seventh Part; because the *Jews* did not travel far, either on the Sabbath Days or other Festivals. *Mat.* xxiv. 20. *Act.* i. 12. *Jos.* Antiq. XIII. 8. 4. XIV. 10. 12. which brings the 110 Days to about 130. as the Length of Time due to our Saviour's bare thirty three Journeys during his Ministry.

II. Besides these *Journeys*, we must estimate as well as we can, the Times of our Saviour's *Abode* at every one of these thirty three Places, whither he came; or rather of thirty of them only: For the Times of his Abode at three of them, the 4th 5th and 8th being known to have been not less than eight Months and forty Days, *i. e.* nine Months and ten Days, we shall set them down by themselves presently; and now estimate the other thirty only: Which Estimation cannot but require at least two Sabbath Days, or a Fortnight for each of these *Abodes*, one with another. Now at this rate thirty *Abodes*, of each a Fortnight's Duration, amount to no less than sixty Weeks, or 420 Days.

III. The Time of Christ's Preaching at *Jerusalem* at the first Passover, and in the Territory of *Judæa* afterward, being that long Interval when Christ and his Disciples *made and Baptized more Disciples than John the Baptist*, *Joh.* iv. 1. was eight Months or about 240 Days; as we have already observ'd.

IV. The Time of the *Temptation* of our Saviour in the Wilderness after his Baptism was, forty Days. *Matth.* iv. 2. *Mark* i. 13. *Luc.* iv. 2.

V. Since

V. Since our Saviour and his Apostles Reading and Preaching in the *Jewish* Synagogues was chiefly, if not wholly confined to Sabbath Days, *Mar. i. 21. vi. 2. Luc. iv. 16. 31. vi. 6. xiii. 10. Act. xiii. 14, 15. 27. 42. 44. xv. 21. 44. xviii. 4.* the Number of Sabbaths or Weeks for such Reading and Preaching in the Synagogues will stand thus, pretty nearly.

(1) Christ's Reading and Preaching in the Synagogue of Nazareth, where he was brought up, and where, as he was wont, he stood up for to Read, *Luc. iv. 16.* may well take up twenty Weeks, or

140 Days.

(2) While Christ Preached in the Synagogues throughout all Galilee, *Matt. iv. 23. Mar. i. 39;* when his Fame went throughout all Syria; at least ten Weeks, or

70 Days.

(3) While Christ went through every City and Village preaching, when the XII were with him: *Matt. ix. 35. Luc. viii. 1.* at least thirteen Weeks, or

91 Days.

(4) While the XII went by two and two, Preaching and healing every where: *Mar. vi. 7. Luc. ix. 6.* at least eight Weeks or

56 Days.

(5) While the LXX went by two and two into every City and Place whither he himself would come, *Luc. x. i.* at least three Weeks or

21 Days.

(6) While Christ came after them to every one of those Cities and Places, at least twenty Weeks or

140 Days.

(7) While many Miracles were wrought by Christ at Chorazin; one of those Cities in which most of his mighty Works, not named in the Gospels, were done, *Matt. xi. 20.* at least eight Weeks, or

56 Days.

(8) While many Miracles were wrought by Christ at Bethsaida another of those Cities in which most of such his mighty Works were done, *ibid.* at least eight Weeks, or

56 Days.

Now

Now $140 + 70 + 91 + 56 + 21 + 140 + 56 + 56 = 630$ Days: Which added to $130 + 420 + 240 + 40 = 830$ are equal to 1460 Days or to just four Years, of 365 Days a-piece.

N. B. All this very well agrees with our Saviour's Words to *Philip* the Apostle, Have I been so long time with you and hast thou not known me *Philip*? Joh. xiv. 9. and with *Herod the Tetrarch's* Desire to have seen him of a long Season; Luc. xxiii. 8. and with *Pilate's* having been not a very few Years Governor of *Judea* at Christ's last Passover, which the *Jews* imply by crying aloud, that he would then release them a Prisoner whom they desired, as he had ever done unto them, at his several former Passovers. Mar. xv. 8. He coming in Governor but in the XIIIth of *Tiberius*, as *Josephus* implies Antiq. XVIII. 4. 2. and by consequence these several Years must reach considerably beyond the XVth of *Tiberius*.

Corollary. Since therefore by these plain and obvious Estimations it is evident at Sight; and this chiefly from the Traces in the three former Evangelists, which are supposed most favourable to a shorter Computation, that our Saviour's Ministry could hardly be so short as four Years, but might well be several Months longer: And since we are inform'd by the fourth Evangelist, Joh. xx. 30, 31. that Many other Signs truly did Jesus in the Presence of his Disciples, which were not written in John's Gospel: and again, Chap. xxi. 25. that There were many other Things that Jesus did; the which if they should be written it was supposed that even the World it self could not contain, or rather, would not receive the Books that should be written. And by *Josephus*, that besides his Resurrection on the third Day, he performed *ἄλλα μυρία θαυμάσια*, ten Thousand other wonderful Works, p. 4.

prius:

prius: It is very probable, that Christ's Ministry was some Months longer than four Years: As I long ago stated it in my *Harmony*. Indeed I still suppose it four Years, besides the twenty Weeks at *Nazareth*. Nor is there any other Determination than this, which can possibly agree with the genuine Copies of *Daniel* and *Nebemiah* concerning the Prophecy of LXX Weeks: As I have largely shewn, in the *Supplement to the Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies*, p. 56—93. to which Treatises I must here refer the inquisitive Reader.

And now I shall proceed to my *second* Design, *viz.* to vindicate the earliest Catholick Fathers from this Imputation, that many of them went into the same Valentinian Notion, and believed that Christ preached but a *single Year*, the 15th of *Tiberius*, and was crucified the same Year. This is not pretended to be true of *Ignatius*, or *Irenæus*, or *Eusebius*, or *Jerom*; and I have already vindicated *Africanus* and *Origen*, p. 156, 157. *prius*: So that there remain only *Clement* of *Alexandria*, and *Tertullian*, in the beginning of the third Century; and *Lactantius* in the beginning of the fourth, to be examined in this Place.

Clement indeed has directly this Valentinian Notion intire; and proves it; as they did, by the Text in *Isaiab*, lxi. 1. 2. read in part by our Saviour in the Synagogue of *Nazareth*, *Luc. iv. 16, 17, 18, 19. To Preach the acceptable Year of the Lord, and the Day of Vengeance or Retribution of our God.* *Strom. I. p. 340. 658.* And no great Wonder: Since *Clement's* Education had been for a while under some of the Old Hereticks, and principally, as is probable, under *Theodotus* the Valentinian. [See *Cave* in *Theodotus* and in *Clement*] till he was reclaim'd and instructed in Catholick Christianity by the famous *Pantænus*.

As for *Tertullian*, tho' in one Place *Contr. Jud. § 8.* he determines that the *Death* of Christ was on the 15th of *Tiberius*; yet does he, in another, confess

fess that he was *made manifest* on the 12th, *Contr. Marcion* I. 15. So that he may seem directly to have agreed to three Years Duration of Christ's Ministry.

And for *Lactantius* in the IVth Century, he determines also that the Death of *Christ* was on the 15th of *Tiberius*: *Institut.* IV. 14. but how long he thought his Ministry lasted, I do not know that he any where informs us. So that, after all the Noise that has been of late made about this Opinion, as ascrib'd to the most primitive Fathers, it is hardly certain of any one of them, but of *Clement* of *Alexandria* only.

But then, that the Apostolical Doctrine or Tradition was originally against this Valentinian Notion, and for the Duration of four or three Years at the least, we have the express Testimony of *Ignatius* Bishop of *Antioch*; one that might be born before our Saviour dyed; in his larger or genuine Epistle to the *Trallians* § 10. and that express Testimony cited as his in the *Chronicon Paschale*, at the XVIIIth of *Tiberius* " That *Christ* was three Decads of Years Old " when he was Baptized; and afterward preached " the Gospel three Years:" very near to what I have determined in my Harmony.

In the next Place *Irenæus* Bishop of *Lyons*, who was born about ten Years after St. *John* dyed, and was acquainted with *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna* made such by St. *John* himself, has a large Discourse for tracing this Opinion from the *Valentinians* and their thirty *Æons*, to which they applyed the thirty Years of *Christ*'s Life, and for confuting it from St. *John*'s Number of Passovers, and from the Tradition of all those that knew St. *John* or the other Apostles. The Discourse is too large to be set down, *Lib.* II. Chap. 38. 39. The most material Passage is this: " All the *Presbyters*, says *Irenæus*, that had " conversed with *John*, the Lord's Disciple; as well " as the Gospel it self, bear witness, that *John* delivered this Tradition down, that Our Lord had

“*ætatem seniore*,” or was of an *elder Age*, and did not dye a *Youth*, or about thirty, as the *Valentinians* pretended. “He adds, that “Some of these “*Presbyters* saw not *John* only, but others of the “*Apostles* also, and heard the same from them, “and bear witness to the same Relation.” *Irenæus* indeed was so far from that Opinion, that he, thinking *Youth* began at thirty and reached from thirty to forty, supposed that *Christ* was above forty when he suffered, and that upon the Credit of this Tradition from the *Apostles*. Which Supposal, tho’ it cannot be true, yet is the Tradition it self most authentick, that *Christ* did not dye a *Youth*, or about thirty, but certainly arriv’d at an *elder Age*. Accordingly the Chronological Characters have obliged me to determine that He lived near thirty seven Years, or considerably beyond thirty five, the middle of seventy, the general Standard of Human Life, in all the latter Ages of the World.

But now, if, after all, I be asked what Sense I put on those Words of *Isaiab*, allעדg’d by the *Valentinians*, *To proclaim the acceptable Year of the Lord, and the Day of Vengeance, or Retribution of our God*; I say first, with *Irenæus*, that since the Word *Day* in the latter Clause, is by none understood for a *bare Day*, but for the *Time of Vengeance* or *Retribution* in general; we may well enough suppose that the *acceptable Year of the Lord* is not a *bare Year*, but the *Time* of the *Messiah’s* Preaching in general, as says the same Prophet elsewhere, xlix. 8. *In an acceptable Time have I heard thee, and in a Day of Salvation have I helped thee*. But if there be any Reference to a particular *Year* in the Prophecy, I should interpret it of the *fourth*, and last Year in the Parable of the Fig-Tree: or, which, I take to be all one, of the *fourth* and last Year of our Saviour’s Ministry: In which Year near two thirds of all that is preserv’d of *Christ’s* Preaching in the four Gospels is included: Particularly the Increase of Labourers in
the

the Vineyard by the Mission and Preaching of the XII Apostles and of the LXX Disciples also: Which were not made use of till about this Time, the fourth and last Year of *Christ's* Ministry.

I conclude the whole therefore with setting down that eminent Parable; which I take to be next to a Demonstration that our Saviour's Ministry did not last less than four compleat Years; and to be it self a thorough Confutation of this *Valentinian*, and all other the like Schemes that shorten it.

Jesus spake this Parable, a certain Man had a Fig-Tree planted in his Vineyard; and he came and sought Fruit thereon, and found none. Then said he unto the Dresser of his Vineyard, Behold, these three Years I come seeking Fruit on this Fig-Tree, and find none; cut it down, why cumbereth it the Ground? And he answering said unto him: Lord, let it alone this Year also, till I shall dig about it and dung it: And if it bear Fruit, well: If not, then after that thou shalt cut it down. Luc. xiii. 6.

Jan. 28. 1733-4.

WILL. WHISTON.

F I N I S.

